LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA

Rittenhouse Orrery

UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

VIII

D. W. Gerhard.

Stanford

THE

Mercersburg Review;

AN ORGAN FOR

CHRISTOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL AND POSITIVE THEOLOGY.

EDITED BY

T. G. APPLE, D.D.,

PRESIDENT OF THE MERCERSBURG COLLEGE, MERCERSBURG, PA.

Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia in semet ipsum recapitulans.—IRENÆUS.

VOLUME XVI.—1869.

PHILADELPHIA:
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
54 N. SIXTH STREET.

STORAGE
205
R255
hep v.16,1869

UNIVERSITY
of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

JANUARY NUMBER.

ARTICLE PAGE.

I. THE CHURCH AND THE STATE.
By the Editor. 5

II. THE ANGELS.
By Rev. M. Kieffer, D. D. 25

III. THE RELATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT TO THE NEW.
By Rev. J. M. Titzel, A. M. 48

IV. THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF HISTORY.
By Prof. E. E. Higbee, D. D. 62

V. THE HISTORICAL ELEMENT IN THEOLOGY.
By Prof. F. V. Gerhart, D. D. 125

VI. ORIGIN AND STRUCTURE OF THE APOSTLES' CREED.
By Prof. J. W. Nevin, D. D. 148

VII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 156

APRIL NUMBER.

I. NOMINALISM AND REALISM.
By Rev. J. H. Dubbs, A. M. 165

II. LUTHER'S TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES; THE NEW TESTAMENT.
By Prof. C. P. Krauth, D. D. 180

III. THE CHRISTOLOGIC PROBLEM.
By Rev. Geo. N. Abbott. 200

IV. REPLY TO DR. DORNER'S CRITICISM ON MERCERSBURG AND MODERN THEOLOGY COMPARED.
By Rev. S. Miller. 218

V. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH MOVEMENT.
By the Editor. 256

VI. THE WISDOM OF GOD IN A MYSTERY.
By Rev. D. H. Riddle, D. D. 277

VII. PREACHING.
By Rev. Geo. Lewis Staley, A. M. 290

VIII. THE UNITY OF THE APOSTLES' CREED
By Prof. J. W. Nevin, D. D. 313

IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 318

JULY NUMBER.

I. THE WRITTEN AND THE INCARNATE WORD.
By Rev. P. S. Davis, A. M. 325

ARTICLE. PAGE.

II. SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.
By Rev. J. W. Santee, A. M. 340

III. THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.
By Prof. Theodore Appel, A. M. 375

IV. TOUCH ME NOT; FOR I AM NOT YET ASCENDED TO MY FATHER.
By Rev. Walter E. Krebs, A. M. 401

V. PSYCHOLOGICO-MORAL REMARKS WITH REFERENCE TO THE HISTORY AND DOCTRINE OF THE FALL.
By Dr. K. H. Sachs, Translated from the German, by Prof. J. B. Kerschner, A. M. 413

VI. GERMAN RATIONALISM AND ITS LESSONS FOR THE AMERICAN CHURCH.
By Rev. J. G. Zahner, D. D. 425

VII. INFIDELITY.
By Rev. Daniel Gans, D. D. 435

VIII. THE CHURCH IN HISTORY.
By Rev. G. Dering Wolff, A. M. 459

IX. CHURCH UNION.
By the Editor. 481

X. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. 490

OCTOBER NUMBER.

I. THE TRUE IDEA OF LIBERAL EDUCATION.
By Tayler Lewis, LL. D. 497

II. IMAGE AND LIKENESS.
By Rev. C. Z. Weiser, A. M. 535

III. PRIESTLY MEDIATION.
By Rev. G. B. Russell, A. M. 552

IV. THE RELATION OF THE PRESENT TO THE PAST AND TO THE FUTURE.
By Rev. J. M. Titzel, A. M. 566

V. THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.
By Rev. D. Y. Heisler, A. M. 578

VI. THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT IN THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED CHURCHES.
By Prof. C. P. Krauth, D. D. 599

VII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.. 647

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1869.

Art. I.—THE CHURCH AND THE SCHOOL.

BY THE EDITOR.

The relation of Christianity to science has been made the subject of earnest and learned discussion in every age since the former became a living power in the world. We propose to discuss the subject on its more practical side, with reference especially to the circumstances under which Christianity is working out its problem in this country. In order to do so, it seems proper to glance briefly at the history of the church in its relation to the school.

In its first entrance into the world, Christianity soon found itself arrayed against all heathen systems of philosophy and learning, as well as against all heathen systems of idolatry. Heathen learning, in its last results, was one with heathen religion. Both were destitute of the true light which had come into the world, in the incarnation of the Son of God. Common education must ever receive its reigning spirit from the character of the higher order of culture that prevails. Hence while the first fathers and theologians fought the battle against heathen science and philosophy, the Church undertook immediately to provide for the education of her own children. The form in which this was done at first was catechization. The young in

every parish were divided into different classes of catechumens. The general division was between the baptized and unbaptized, and these again were subdivided into different classes. About the middle of the second century we read of the school at Alexandria, which, it is true, became more of a philosophico-theological Seminary than a catechetical school proper, yet it stands as a witness of the deep interest the Church took in the education of her sons. The same is true of the school of Antioch. Of course, it was a necessity at first that Christian children should acquire the rudiments of learning in heathen schools, but this was accompanied by most careful instruction in the family and catechetical classes, to counteract the baneful and dangerous tendency of these schools, until the Church had the power and was prepared to control them. This took place, of course, as soon as the civil power fell under the control of the Church. From that time forward the work of education continued in all its departments to be of a christian character. Indeed we may say, that the Church was the only power that saved and revived learning and culture, amidst the overwhelming avalanche of barbarism that rushed down upon the Roman Empire, and threatened to blot out all trace of refinement, of science and art. We need not refer particularly to the agency of the Church in the rise and progress of the great European Universities. From these fountains the whole domain of educational work, so far as it was carried on and made general, received its character and strength.

After the Reformation a great change took place in the relation of Church and State. Indeed one of the elements of strife that entered into that great movement was just the protest and opposition of civil rulers against the authority of the pope in the civil order. The struggle between the spiritual and temporal power which had gone on for centuries, with various fortunes, though generally leaving the Church master of the situation, ended now as to its old form in the new era that was ushered in. The Protestant Church started with no power or disposition to rule in the civil order; but unfortunately in many cases the State assumed unwarrantable control

of the Church. Hence in the countries of Europe there exists still an abnormal union of Church and State, so that the former is still far from being free in its operations. Yet in this combination the Church exerts, more or less, a controlling influence in the schools. In Prussia, from which we have largely obtained our model for the public school system, Christianity in a positive form enters into their instructions. The catechism is taught as regularly as grammar or geography, and the school-master is under the direction of the minister, though both are also servants of the State.

In this country the problem comes before us in a new and different aspect. Church and State commence here as distinct and separate interests, in a way which, we think, will in the end promote the best interests of each. Yet, it is true, that their present separation can only be regarded as freely preparing the way for more full coöperation in regard to all those interests of man in reference to which they occupy common ground. We regard it as a startling fact that the interest and work of education in this country have been allowed so generally to go forward without the direct agency of the Church. In the earlier times of our history, before any general system of education was devised, the Church was accustomed to look after this interest. The first schools in this country were what are now called private, or select-schools. The people directly provided for the education of their children, and as the early settlers were to a large extent members of the Church, provision was made directly for their religious training in the schools. These schools were, according to the custom of the countries from which the early colonists emigrated, conducted under the immediate auspices of the Church. The school-house even in New-England, as well as in the Middle and Southern States, was built along-side the Meeting-house or Church. The school-master was expected to be a religious man, a member of the Church, and to perform his duties very much under the supervision of the minister. It was not dreamed in those early times that education should be divorced from the Church. From the fact that the early colon-

eis were, for the most part, established from religious motives, all social interests were largely ruled by the Church. Church and State were virtually, and in some cases formally, united, and the Church here was the ruling power.

As the colonies, however, grew into states, and finally into a nation, Church and State became separated. Under our free republican institutions, where every man is a sovereign, it was soon felt that all the citizens should be educated. Accordingly the State at once set about making provision for this end. The system of public schools was inaugurated, and the attention of our wisest and best statesmen was directed to making it efficient and complete. This was considered one of the most fundamental necessities for the prosperity and perpetuity of a free State. Without it, republican institutions could not succeed. Ever since, the American public-school system has been regarded as the pride and glory of the nation.

This system has been inaugurated and carried forward to its present state of efficiency, not without earnest protest on the part of Christian men. Though the opposite spirit has ruled, yet many earnest minds in the Church have felt all along, that in an interest in which Church and State have a common work to perform, the former should, in some form, be represented. A large number of the children in our public schools are not only inchoate citizens, but also children of the Church. They are to be trained not only for the duties of citizens but also for the higher duties of the Christian. Here was a palpable, flagrant, wrong, which many felt and deplored.

Certainly no one can complain of the State for attempting to educate its own citizens. On the other hand it deserves commendation and praise for what it has done in this respect. Nor can any one censure the State for not making its schools, in the full sense, Christian schools. Civil government has not been called, nor has it the power, to minister in the sphere of grace. It cannot authoritatively teach the Scriptures, nor can it administer the Sacraments and Ordinances of our holy religion. The most that the State can do is, to recognize the office and mission of the Church, and direct her, where it has

the power, as in Europe, or invite her, as would be the case in this country, to perform her proper functions in the schools. As to inviting the Church to coöperate directly in the conduct of the schools in this country, the civil government could make the plea, that the Church is so divided, and the interests of her divisions so conflicting, that it would be almost, if not quite impossible, to obtain any assistance from her. Which of the various denominations shall teach the Scriptures in the schools? Which shall come among the children with the rule of life and the sacred ordinances? Besides, even if Christian Churches should agree as to the form of coöperation in the schools which would suit their interests, how would the matter affect Jews and unbelievers generally?

If the matter were pressed, we believe the conclusion would be, that civil government in this country does not propose to teach religion in any form, and cannot, therefore, consistently, teach even true and sound morality, for this latter is based on true religion. In this view, we regard the plea, that Christianity in some general form can be introduced into our public schools on their present base, that the Bible can be read, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer repeated, and such subjects of a religious character introduced as the Churches are generally agreed upon, as vain. Whatever might be done incidentally here and there in this way, the theory of the system rules it out, and hence no advantage of a permanent character can be gained. Yet for all this we have no accusation to bring against the State for not doing what it cannot do of itself. All that it can do is to see and acknowledge that *its* system of education is dangerously incomplete, and therefore inefficient for training the young to be good citizens. It is as much the duty of the State to acknowledge the authority and mission of the Church, as it is the duty of the latter to recognize, and teach obedience to the former.

What we do complain of, and what we regard as a startling fact is, that during all this time the Church has done so little directly in the interest of general education. She has coolly stood aloof and allowed the State to take her little ones from

her bosom, and train them up in a step-motherly way. The only exception to this remark is, the work the Church has performed in the higher institutions of learning. Moved, at first, by the necessity of having educated ministers she has indeed, in some cases with liberal munificence, endowed theological seminaries and colleges. To the Church is the public indebted for establishing and maintaining the College-system in this country. And we gladly concede the religious influence which has been thus brought to bear upon the whole interest of education. In this sphere the interest of science in its highest form, in philosophy, has been guarded from falling over entirely into the hands of infidelity. But even here the Church has by no means done her full duty. Our colleges are only partially under the care of the Church. Except in a few strictly denominational colleges the Church does not undertake in these institutions to teach authoritatively the positive doctrines of the Christian religion. They may use the Bible in some sort as a text-book, but as to catechism or creed, through which the truths of Scripture come to a form as the teaching of the Church, they are for the most part entirely unknown. There is preaching in our colleges, but with few exceptions the Sacraments are not administered as well. But even at best our colleges are only a part of an educational system in which the Church is most deeply interested.

Shall the Church look only after the young men who have reached the collegiate department, and pay no regard to those of her sons in the Academy and Grammar School? Shall she allow the great mass of her children, who are educated only in the public schools, to pass out of her care and control, so far as their education is concerned? And shall she allow her daughters in seminaries for young ladies to be educated to a large extent apart from her direct presence and care? These are questions which press for a satisfactory answer.

One answer given by many is, that there is no need of any religious instruction in the week-day school because the Church attends to this interest on Sunday, and also through the week in Christian families. According to this view, the two interests

of religious and secular education are so separate and distinct, that each can be carried forward in this way. And the State, finding that its own system is wanting in a most serious respect, sometimes appeals to the Church to come to its rescue. Thus a short time ago, the active and efficient superintendent of public schools in Pennsylvania, Prof. Wickersham, acknowledged, at a convention of Sunday-school teachers held in Lancaster, that the training of the State-schools needed the influence of the Christian religion, in order to carry out the true idea of education. He sought to find the solution of the difficult problem in the Sunday-schools. Let them be properly organized, graded, and made truly efficient, and the system of education among us will be rendered complete. This acknowledgment from a State Superintendent of Public Schools is highly significant. It shows that even among the friends and advocates of the public school system it is felt that the State alone cannot properly attend to the whole interest of education. It shows, moreover, that something more is needed than merely the general moulding influence of Christianity to preserve our popular system of education from infidelity. The Church, in a direct and positive way, has a work to perform. Sunday-schools, at least, as a part of the educational machinery of the Church, must come to the rescue, and save the week-day schools from their downward tendency.

But this evidently is not enough. It is not sufficient that the State educate during the six days of the week, and the Church only one day. The Christian religion is a religion not only for Sunday, but for every day. Can the Church allow her children to live in the atmosphere of the world all the days of the week,—have their associations with children of unbelievers, pursue their studies in schools where no positive religious influence confronts them, and expect that all will be made right by an hour's religious instruction on Sunday? This view goes on the supposition that the Christian religion pertains only to one department of our nature, and therefore can be satisfied by giving it only one portion of our time and attention. As though what is called secular learning can be complete in itself,

and its wants fully attended to apart from Christianity in any form, and then the Church may come in to complete the work by adding her religious instruction. The two orders of our life, the religious and the secular surely are not thus related. The latter, to be true and complete in its own sphere, requires the constant presence and benediction, at all points, of the former. No, this will not answer the case, as all must readily see and feel.

Another answer to the difficult problem already hinted at, is, that the best we can do is to go forward and infuse positive moral and religious influence into the schools. Let those who find fault with them in their present condition, do something to improve them. Let ministers and christian families generally put forth efforts to bring them under the power of Christianity. Let Boards of Control introduce works on moral science, and select teachers of at least good moral character, and thus seek to make the best out of them.

If there were no other solution of the problem, this certainly would be better than nothing. But the very unsatisfactory character of it is, to our mind, sufficient to prove that we cannot rest in it. The very announcement of such an effort by the Church would awaken suspicion, and it would soon have to be decided whether such attempts to introduce Christianity into the schools is not against the system itself, and the laws by which it is controlled. Here, we think a difficulty would soon arise. In some communities, especially the German, where the people generally belong to the Church, and where the traditional feelings that Church and schools ought not to be separated, it might be done, but even there it would have to be done rather by concession than by right. Any one might raise an objection, and it would be difficult to set it aside. As to the teaching of any positive moral science, we have already urged, and we repeat it, no system of morality can be sound which does not stand in living union with Christianity. To attempt any other is to give up the question of introducing the Christian religion into our schools. To try to make it such without positively asserting its Christian foundation would be less than the Church

has a right to claim for her own children, and for unbelievers would be only an evading of the issue.

We must seek, then, some other solution of the difficult problem. How is the Church to assert her proper functions in the system of popular education in this country? We assume that this is desirable. It is coming to be felt more and more that education in itself is not necessarily a good. The old German doubts and suspicions on this subject are being felt to carry with them some force, and to be not merely the result of ignorance. New England smartness is not enough to sustain a nation. It is a power, but it may be a power to disintegrate and destroy, as it certainly will be where it is united with no sound morality.

Indeed this is revealing itself in more ways than one, as our nation is confronted more and more with the spiritual problems that concern its mission. The guiding minds of the nation may be scholars and philosophers, but if their political philosophy be not of a truly Christian character, even though it come in this garb, the ship of State will soon be stranded on the fatal shoals, or dashed headlong against the destroying rock.

We assume that our present separation of Church and State, as distinguished from the abnormal and forced relation in which the two are held bound together in Europe, is a legitimate and proper advance on previous history. We would not go back to the old, when as in the palmy days of Roman power, the State was made a mere slave of the Church, or where as in the Protestant State-system of Europe, the Church is employed as a mere function of the State. We look for a free union of Church and State, in which each shall be able to perform its proper work, as institutions having one God for their author, for the good of our race. And the present separation in this country is only a preparation for this end. Clearly the one needs the other. What would our State be without the Christian Church in these United States? What would have been its fate in the late struggle for existence, if the Church had not proclaimed, often indeed passionately and indiscreetly, that the powers that be are ordained of God? What would become of the oath, and

marriage, and the day of rest, those guardians of morality, without the Church? As the Church and the State each recognize the authority of the other in reference to these common interests or institutions, so we hold there must be a common ground on which they must meet and coöperate on the subject of popular education, and that mutual coöperation must be of a different, more intimate, character than we have found in the solutions already noticed. We are not satisfied that the State should have the week and the Church the Sunday in this work, nor that the Church should, as it were surreptitiously, attempt to infuse some vague general influence into the schools. We want far more than this; and we believe the day is coming when the State will be glad to invite more, for it needs it full as much as the Church.

Our principal concern at present, however, is for the Church. What shall she do in order to have proper control over the education of her own children? Let there be, we answer, for a time *a more marked antithesis* between the two, the Church and State, in order to a more intimate and yet free union hereafter. The State is already sufficiently marked and prominent in the work of education. It needs educated citizens and it sets about earnestly and actively to educate them. Let the Church do the same. She needs that her children shall be religiously educated, that their training shall be wholly guarded from the secular and profane. Let her set about doing her own work.

Let our colleges, those at least that are under the exclusive care of Christian denominations, be made more positively and fully Christian. There are two problems, falling indeed very much together, which a Christian college is to answer. One is in relation to the character and tendency of science in general. Upon our colleges depends the direction which is to be given to science in the form of philosophy. This may be infidel or Christian. If it be not truly Christian, the whole tendency of science as it is made to confront the minds of students will be dangerous and injurious.

But colleges are concerned directly with the personal cha-

racter and well-being of the young who are gathered to enjoy their instruction and training. A very important period of life is passed in them by those who are entrusted to their care. It is a period during which character is undergoing formation. That this may be formed aright, it is necessary that the students should be brought to stand within the influence and power of the Christian Church. In most cases they are required to attend divine service once on Sunday in some church in the village or town in which the college is located. In some, they are supplied with preaching in the college chapel. But in how few are they brought into the warm life of a congregation, in which the full power and activity of a Church are felt! For this purpose the college should be at the same time a Church, where not only the word is preached but the sacraments also dispensed. Some one or more of the professors should be charged with pastoral care over the students. They should find in their literary home all the care and attention which they would receive at the hands of a faithful pastor in that home from which, with all its hallowed influences, if a Christian home, they are now separated. Positive religious instruction should be imparted to them, not with a merely scientific interest, but with direct reference to their spiritual well-being. In the college chapel there should be not only a pulpit or desk, but also an altar. Each session they should gather around it to partake of the holy communion. All this would be of immensely more account than what is ordinarily done in these institutions in a religious way, even where it is customary to have what is called a revival now and then.

All this could be without the presence of setarianism in the bad sense. It would hold up before the minds and hearts of students the Christian Church, but the Church is a Catholic institution, founded by Christ with its word and sacraments, and its obligations are of binding force upon all men. Those who should chose to stand aloof from it could do so, of course, but they would have to do so in the face of its admonishing presence. If the world should be moved to establish colleges in which there would be no Church, let it be done. We do not

believe the Christian civilization of this country would venture thus to array itself against the Church, but if it should, it would only serve to bring out in contrast the two orders of education, an issue not to be shunned. As it is, every respectable denomination has its own college, and the religious bias of all could be satisfied. Those who have no religious status would have to be satisfied with pursuing their education under the influence of a Church institution. Without dwelling longer here, we merely raise the qestion why it is so generally considered proper and pious to introduce a part of the Church's functions, *preaching*, into our colleges, while the other equally essential part, the *sacraments*, is left away?

Next to the colleges are the Academies or Boarding Schools. Into these are gathered a large portion of the youth of the land. They are also generally established under the auspices of some Christian denomination. They generally seek to proclaim that the moral and religious interests of those confided to their care are properly attended to. This is regarded as a very necessary part of their commendation. Even parents who make no pretension to being Christians themselves, yet desire their children to be trained under Christian influence. Church schools are well patronized on this account. Even Roman Catholic schools have been sought out for this reason by many Protestants. Parents have admired the discipline which, it is thought, their churchly character guarantees. We feel assured that the same would be the case with any Protestant school which is conducted under a positive Churchly influence, without being narrowly sectarian. Denominational differences are lost sight of in the earnest desire of parents that their children shall be religiously educated.

Yet it is a notorious fact that even here where the Church is untrammelled by contact with any school law of the State, but few schools have ventured to make themselves *Church schools* in the full sense of the term. They are more cared for in this respect, it is true, than the common schools, but they are, as a rule, not Christian, if to be Christian requires, as a necessary article of faith, the presence of the Holy Catholic Church with all her

essential functions. For here, as in the case of our colleges, it is only one side of the Church, the preaching of the gospel, that is made to confront the students, and this generally not in the institution proper, but in some neighboring church or churches which they are required to attend. With the holy sacraments they are not familiarized as a necessary part of Christianity, conceded to be such by universal Christendom.

Here, then, is a field open to the Churches. Nothing hinders their occupying it. Why should they not at least provide fully for their own children, so that when, in the most interesting and critical period of life, they are separated from pastoral care at home, they may enjoy it, in its full power, in the Boarding School? How many of her own children are lost to the Church, just because during the period of their education, running through two, three, and five years, sometimes a longer period, they are left to so large an extent, uncared for as to their relations to the Church. None will deny this who takes into conception of Christianity the fact of the Church. With those who can rest satisfied with that kind of Christianity which leaves this out of view, which sublimates it into a mere phantom, we have no room just here for controversy.

It may be urged here again, that schools of another kind, which either profess to teach no religion, or to teach a religion without a Church, would be established in opposition to these. So let it be. We would rather see the issue made, than that the Church should be ruled out altogether. If it were once properly made we believe one step would be taken towards a wiser and better consideration of the whole subject than we have yet had. The order of grace, if it be a supernatural order at all, must assert itself as such before it can properly be acknowledged and enter into the stream of the world's life in any form. That kind of marriage with the world which rules out one of its leading features, and makes it to consist merely in a refined theory or system of morality, will prove fatal in the end to its own highest interest.

The cry comes out from all portions of the Protestant Church for ministers. Young men crowd into every avenue of busi

ness, and fill up every profession, while there are hardly enough entering the ministry to fill the places of those who are removed by death? Why is this? There is more than one reason which we might name, and which would bear discussion. We submit whether one may not be found just here. What is there in our Boarding Schools to instil or foster a desire to enter the ministry? Are not our sons rather educated away from the holy calling? Has not the order of our education become so alarmingly secular that the kingdom of grace is turned into a far off shadowy realm? And is not this just one of the results of ignoring the Church in which this kingdom is made to confront the young in a real form?

Without pursuing this part of our subject further, we proceed to inquire what the Church is to do in reference to the public schools, in which the larger number of her children are educated.

Here doubtless lies the most difficult part of the problem. We would utter no tirade against the Public-school system, nor would we present impracticable visionary schemes. This system in its own sphere has doubtless done much good. We would not call it heathen in the sense of ancient heathenism. There is a sense in which these schools may be called Christian, as was urged by Prof. Wickersham, who seems to at least realize the importance of the problem involved, in that those who send children to them are generally Christian people. They do not, at least, teach systems of idolatry. Indirectly and incidentally much Christian influence surrounds them and enters into them. Their teachers as a class are upright, and very many of them Christians. But with all that may be urged in their favor, it must be conceded that the Christian Church, as concerned equally with the State in the education of the young, does not connect itself with them as the State does. And those who would doubtless differ much from us in our view of the case, are casting about to know how to remedy what is defective. We are pleased with the freedom with which the subject in this aspect is now discussed in educational conventions. We do not believe the difficulty is insuperable. Under our free in-

stitutions, if the people of a community are united in their wishes, we see nothing that would necessarily hinder them from introducing into their schools, under the school law, positive religious instruction. At least it is given out by those who ought to know that this could be done. But the difficulty is that in no community, or in few communities, are the people thus unitedly disposed. The Church and the world are both represented, and the children of the world claim the right, under the law, of being left free from any Church entanglements.

What can the Church do here? We answer, until some proper adjustment can be made, if it can indeed be made, let the Church look to the establishment of *parochial schools*. The idea is not new, but it is none the less true because it is old. In theory it is conceded by the churches generally to be good. There is hardly a congregation or parish that would not prefer a school for their children, under the supervision of the Church, to the public school. They would prefer that their teacher should be a Christian, trained religiously for his work. They would be glad to have their pastor visit and direct in its operations. They would be glad to have their children taught day by day in the Bible or catechism, or both. But they shrink from the antagonism that would thus be established with schools of another character. Then the expense is an important item. They are taxed for the support of the public schools. They could not afford, in addition, to support their own. Such would be the objections urged. And perhaps the chief objection of all would be, that by this course the Church would give up altogether the State schools to the world, and thus lose the prospect of making them in any sense Christian.

We believe, notwithstanding all these objections, that it is the wisest and best policy for the Church to put itself thus in antithesis with the world by establishing parochial schools. If society generally comes to see and feel, after a while, that the Church ought to combine with the State, in some way, in the conduct of public schools, let the antithesis come to an end. But we do not believe this will be realized until the Church first lay hold to the matter with earnestness and vigor, and as-

sert her functions with reference to the education of her own children. We believe especially that this is needed in order to place a check upon the intense worldly spirit that now rules in the schools, as well as in all departments of life. For it is in this form, after all, that the spirit of our public schools stands in antagonism with Christianity. The atmosphere in which they move is altogether worldly. The whole scope and aim for which they educate is bounded on all sides by man's natural life. The sphere of the spiritual, as that in which alone this life can come to its true and proper meaning and destiny is left entirely away. There are different degrees here, it is true. The worldly life may not be limited to the interests of the merely physical side of man's nature. It may rise higher than merely pecuniary interests. It may seek to educate the mind for its own sake,—may advocate the culture of his æsthetical nature, urge the cultivation of good manners and morals, but still it owns no supernatural world, as really brought to man by the new creation in Christianity. Here it is that the Church, if she would maintain and prosecute her vocation in the world, must break with the order of the world's life. And here it is that she needs above all to surround her children with that atmosphere in which alone they can grow up in their true character.

Now let us consider the practical force of the difficulties in the way of thus entering upon an education of her own in the form of parochial schools.

In regard to the matter of expense, we would not have a greater difficulty to meet than has been met, for instance, for years, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, where the churches independent of the Establishment maintain themselves in addition to the regular tax required of them for the support of the established religion. It is somewhat of a burden to them, but they bear it cheerfully for the sake of the great interest, as they believe, involved. So, also, if the interest of the Church and our children require it, this burden also can be borne. But we believe that if this were undertaken by the churches generally, the State would feel called upon to allow

them their proper share of the taxes. This would be no more than just. Thus the Church would be acknowledged, and attention would be directed to some adjustment which would satisfy the interests of both. This is the point which we would see reached, and which we do not believe will be reached so long as the Church, as such, stands aloof. There would be poor children whose parents would not be able to incur any expense, above the small tax now imposed, for the education of their children. But could not those who are blessed with wealth provide for such? Certainly there would need to be no difficulty here.

But even if parochial schools should not be universally or generally established, yet we should not, therefore, refrain from attempting anything. One or two even of such character in a town would accomplish a good work. They would hold up before the community the sacredness of the interest involved, and be a standing witness for the Church.

As to the other objection, that the State schools would thus be given over to the world, we need only say, that the Church cannot help that if it cannot be avoided. She is to guard the interest of her own children first, and if the world is left alone, it ought to lead that world to seek for admission into her fold. But this need not be the case. Good men would feel an interest also for these world schools, and as much could be done for them at any rate as is now done for schools generally. Would that the Church could be brought to make the trial in a serious and earnest way.

In order to be successful, provision should be made for suitable teachers. These should be trained for their work. They should devote themselves heartily to it. It would be a noble sphere of labor. Many who now see in the work of teaching no moral purpose or end, and regard it only as a stepping-stone to something else, would make it the work of their lives. And there would be those, male and female, who would be willing to do so without regard specially to remuneration. The churches would make provision for the destitute, and a work would be accomplished which would tell upon all her interests.

But, it may be said, it is not consistent with the genius of Protestantism thus to separate the secular and religious orders of life. According to Protestantism, Christianity must enter into the world's life, become one with it, in order thus to mould it aright. It is only Romanism that thus antagonizes the two orders of life. This we grant. But there must be antagonism before there can be true union. Christ thus antagonized His religion with the world. The early Church came first in conflict with heathendom. And even those two institutions, the Church and State, which own a common author, though in different senses, God, require just such antithesis in order to a true synthesis.

In this country we are preparing for a new solution of the difficult problem involved in the relation of these two to each other. Thus far, in the matter of popular education, the State has been almost the only active factor. Christianity has been honored and respected, but the *Church* has been but little recognized. And she never will be recognized until she assert her presence and prerogatives. Let her do this, and we believe, the State will not refuse her most reasonable claims.

Then, too, the Church will feel the necessity pressing upon her from a new direction, to seek to attain some tangible unity. This has been felt to some extent already. In the matter of Sunday-schools this necessity has called out a union literature, which we regard, indeed, as in the main a failure, because the Churches did not properly realize the nature of the work called for, because only a portion of them are represented in it, and because she had not yet reached that unity which is necessary for such a literature. Accordingly we would not consider the Church as prepared just now to propose unitedly just what she needs in the day schools. To attempt this at the present time would, we think, result in a failure. Better would it be for each denomination, for the time, to provide for its own schools. But we might hope that this would lead to something better. The question of Church union presses now with increasing force on its own merits. This common work would only give it still greater power. Churches would feel more than ever, that as

the State is one, and confronts the Church with a definite system, so on the other hand the Church should be one, in order to meet the State in this common interest.

Our great danger in this country has been, and now is, that we take the existing status of things in Church and State as finally settled. Doubtless our basis of freedom is right, but we are as yet only in a formative period. It could not well be otherwise. Never before in history has the problem of Church and State presented itself as it does in this country. They stand here apart, each one enjoying its own measure of freedom. But their relation to each other is such that they must come together at various points in the way of coöperation. Hence questions of adjustment must continually arise. As an illustration of this, take the case of the right of the State in times of war to draft ministers to serve in the army. No nation in Christian times had done it before. The United States without ceremony asserted the right and exercised it. We believe the nation committed a sin in doing so, but the Church, as a whole entered no protest, and consequently the question of right did not seriously arise. Suppose, however, that the Church as a whole had taken a stand against the claim, it is clear that this question would have had to come to some adjustment, which would be in accordance with right, and not merely with might. The manner in which the government treated those religious bodies which are conscientiously opposed to taking up arms, shows that it is ready to consider what is just to the rights of all concerned. And we believe its decision in regard to ministers would have been different, if the Church itself had taken a proper position.

Now we regard the work of popular education as one of those questions in which it is only necessary for each to assert its prerogative in order to prepare the way for a proper adjustment. But this requires time. Were we to attempt to settle the question before the necessary data are present, we would be liable to fall into grievous error. The public-school system is regarded, indeed, by many as a model of perfection, They imagine that it is settled and fixed in its principles for all coming

time. Such a view, however, only gives evidence that it is hastily formed. Our nation is too young as yet to expect that she has even had the necessary conditions presented for the final settlement of such important problems. We need patience to wait, and a teachable disposition that we may be guided aright. The forces of history flow together in this country in such a manner, as to lead the wisest and best to tremble in view of the momentous problems that are here to find their solution. We cannot return to any old-world scheme that will answer our purpose in such a case. Neither the Roman Catholic theory, which always tends by inward necessity to unduly subordinate the State to the Church, nor the Protestant alliances of Church and State in Europe, can answer our wants. We need a new adjustment, suited to the advanced stadium of freedom upon which we have entered. We need be in no special haste to arrive at a conclusion. It accords with the American spirit to act quickly and promptly, but on this account we often have to reopen important questions for new adjustment. Let us not seek to be hasty, in this. Let the Church as a whole first awake to its high and responsible work in the education of the young, especially of her own children. Let her at the cost of any amount of labor seek to perform her duty. For the time being, let her do it apart from entangling alliances with the State. Let her see to it that in all her institutions of learning the presence of all her functions may be felt. Meanwhile there need be no collision. No one need array himself against the State for striving to do its work in its own way. Then, when the Church has properly asserted her prerogative as an institution of Him who is Head over all things, and whom Kings and princes must at last acknowledge and obey, the way will be open for a new system of popular education in which Church and State shall harmoniously perform their functions, and the odium which now attaches to our common school system will be rolled off.

THE ANGELS.

BY REV. MOSES KIEFFER, D.D.

THE word Angel is of Greek origin, and means a messenger one sent. The Hebrew word, translated angel, has the same meaning. This term is somewhat indefinite, and for this reason some have supposed that the doctrine of the angels does not properly belong to theological science. But this objection is without ground, because we find that many of God's creatures are named not so much according to their specific nature, as their peculiar activity and employment. For instance the Greek name of man means one who turns up the countenance. So our English word man, evidently taken from the Latin word "mens," means one who thinks. So the word angel as applied to a distinct order, or class of rational beings designates a peculiar kind of activity from which the character of the acting agent may be easily inferred.

In sundry Scriptures the term is applied to human beings. For instance in Gen. xxxii. 3; Numb. xx. 14; Prov. xxiii. 17; Luke vii. 24. "And Jacob sent messengers (Maleakim Angels) before him to Esau, his brother." "And Moses sent messengers from Kadesh to the king of Edom." "A wicked messenger falleth into mischief." "And when the messengers of John were departed," etc. "I will send my messenger." Thus Prophets and Bishops are called sometimes Maleakim, or angels, (See Haggai i. 13; Mal. ii. 7; iii. 1; Math. xi. 10; Mark, i. 2; Rev. i. 20; ii. 1, etc.) "Then spake Haggai the Lord's messenger." "For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts." "Behold, I will send my messen-

ger, and he shall prepare the way before me." "For this is he of whom it is written; Behold, I send my messenger, &c." "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches." "Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus write." These scriptures teach us that God may employ men as messengers, but they do not yet teach us that there is an order of intelligent messengers distinct from men. For proof of this doctrine we must examine another class of Scripture passages altogether. Those of the Old Testament must be compared with those of the New. It has been said that in the Old Testament we find evident traces of the angelic doctrine; and that it is fully established in the New Testament. We shall find that there is truth in this remark if we follow the law of interpretation which requires that the doctrine be studied in its living connection with the presence of Christ, in whom the entire word of God finds its meaning. We proceed to gather up, therefore,

1. The principal Scriptures which prove that angels are personal creatures.

2. The Relative Position must be considered, which the angels hold in the created sphere of existence, or their employment; And

3. Their history.

I. From Gen. iii. 24, we learn that God placed cherubim at the east of the garden of Eden to guard, or keep, the way of the tree of life. In reference to this passage some make the admission that it does not contain the angelic doctrine. Taking it by itself the admission may be justified. But when taken in connection with other scriptures which speak of the cherubim in the heavenly state as an order of beings next in rank to the seraphim, the passage is not without value. Then in the very outset we meet with beings who glow with heavenly light and heavenly love. A cherub is something more than a figure of different forms. As a figure is the external form of an idea, so here the cherubim with sword in hand imply living angels, holy and *intelligent*, whom God employs to keep the way of the tree of life. That tree of life is Christ, and only intelligent beings can keep, guard, defend the way of this tree.

From this it follows, as said by Dr. Ebrard, that we must not conceive of the images of the cherubim on the mercy seat, as the images of beasts. These are the images of intelligences who honor the Lord with their presence. For be it remembered Christ is the true mercy-seat, (see Rom. iii. 25,) "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood." See also 1 Sam. iv. 4. "So the people sent to Shiloh, that they might bring from thence the ark of the covenant of the Lord of hosts, which dwelleth between the cherubim; and the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, were there with the ark of the covenant of God." 2 Sam. vi. 2. "And David arose and went with all the people that were with him from Baale of Judah to bring up from thence the ark of God, whose name is called by the name of the Lord of hosts that dwelleth between the cherubim." Isa. xxxvii. 16. "O Lord of hosts, God of Israel, that dwellest between the cherubim." These then are holy intelligences dwelling in the immediate presence of *their* Lord, and our Lord. This sublime truth that angels dwell with and accompany our Lord is of frequent occurrence. Thus in Gen. xviii. 1, 2, 3. When the Lord appeared unto Abraham in human form two other men accompanied him, who (in Gen. xix. 1) are called Maleakim. As the Lord in the form of a theophany appeared to Abraham as the angel of the covenant, so the two angels, who visited Lot in Sodom, proved themselves to be more than men. They strike the riotous inhabitants with blindness, and effected the deliverance of Lot and his family, declaring that they were sent to destroy the city.

By reading these narratives carefully and studying the character and activity of these *Maleakim* it becomes quite clear that they are intelligent beings, not residents of our earth, but of heaven — possessing greater strength than men; yet obedient to the will of God. In a parallel line with the above stands the sublime language recorded in Isa. vi. 1, 2, 3. "In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the *Lord* sitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphim; each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his

feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried to another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory." This is the language of *rational* beings, who know God their creator, who heartily love him, and glorify and praise him forever.

Here we must not fail to notice Jacob's vision of the ladder, reaching from earth to heaven, "And behold, the angels of God ascending and descending on it," Gen. xxviii. 12. Compare John i. 51, "And he (Christ) saith unto him (Nathanael) verily, verily I say unto you, hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of Man." The ladder, seen by Jacob, is evidently a type of Christ. It is set up on the earth and reaches to heaven, *i. e.* it connects our earthy abode with the heavenly; above it God stands in the attitude of attention looking down upon his humble pilgrims in this vale of tears. So Christ is the real mystic ladder which unites the heavenly abode with the earthly, the divine nature with the human; through him God regards the human race in tender mercy, and on him the angels of God ascend and descend, on their errands of love. In and through him all that was beheld by Jacob in prophetic vision and all that was promised to Nathanael, the Israelite, indeed, is fulfilled.

It has been supposed by some that the declaration made by our Saviour to Nathanael will not be verified until the day of the final judgment, when the Son of Man will come in the clouds in company with the angels to judge the world in righteousness. That awful solemnity may indeed be regarded as a fulfilment of this prediction in one of its aspects. But the design of our Saviour was not, in this instance, to impress this humble Israelite with a sense of the reality of last times, so much as to encourage and comfort him with the assurance of angelic communion with the true Israelites of the Gospel dispensation. Here there is not only a communion of saints, but also a communion of the saints with the angels in heaven, even in Christ in whom all things are reheaded both of things in heaven and things on the earth. All this teaches that the an-

gels are personal creatures. They have consciousness, will, and reason, and are capable of joy. "There is joy in Heaven," &c. This too is against the rationalistic view which teaches that the Old Testament doctrine of the angels was only developed after the exile, and that it was actually derived from the religion of the Persians; hence it is maintained that Christ accommodated himself to the Jews in this respect in his frequent allusions to the angels. This accommodation theory is so obviously without ground that the bare naming of it is a sufficient refutation. That the Jews, except the Sadducees, believed in the existence of personal angels, as an order of beings distinct from men, there is not the least doubt. Now their belief is either grounded in truth, or it is not. If not, then Christ and the Apostles deceived them; this, of course, they could not do if they were true teachers. Besides the angels actually appeared in the New Testament times to sundry persons whose testimony cannot be doubted, unless we doubt the entire Gospel. For instance, the angel Gabriel was sent from God to the virgin Mary, and came unto her and said: "Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women." Luke i. 26, 27, 28.

The angel of the Lord appeared unto Joseph. Matt. i. 20; ii. 13. There appeared unto Zacharias an angel of the Lord, standing on the right side of the altar of incense. Luke i. 11. The angel of the Lord came upon the shepherds, and said unto them: "Fear not; for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David, a Saviour which is Christ the Lord." Luke ii. 10, 11. The angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled away the stone from the door of the Saviour's sepulchre, and for fear of him the keepers did quake and became as dead men. And the angel said to the women, "Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified." Matt. xxviii. 2, 3, 4, 5.

Thus far but a single angel is named each time. Perhaps this is but the theophany of the Old Testament repeated. Be it so. The Son of God could not appear in the form of an

angel, if there were not an order or class of such beings. To Mary Magdalene, to Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, however, *angels* appeared and said that Jesus was risen from the grave. Luke xxiv. 4, 22. In a vision an angel appeared to Cornelius. Acts x. 3. So angels appeared at sundry times to the different apostles. Acts v. 19; xii. 7; xxvii. 23, &c. See especially Rev. v. 2, 11. "And I saw an angel proclaiming with a loud voice, &c. "And I beheld! and heard the voice of *many* angels round about the throne," &c.

Angels came and ministered unto Christ himself. Matt. iv. 11; Mark i. 13; Luke xxii. 43; John xii. 29.

Here as Dr. Ebrard says, to whom I am indebted mainly for aid in making these references, "the admission of the accommodation theory is impossible." To deny the doctrine of the angels we must, to be consistent, deny the entire Bible.

The specific difference between angels and men consists in this that the latter have material bodies and are generically connected with their race, which is not the case with the former. They are spirits, though not emanations from God who is a spirit, but *created* spirits. They are not omnipresent, they are confined to space; hence they must have bodies, and a habitation; their proper home is heaven; yet, as said, they have not material bodies. When they come to our earth they are transient visitors. Some have supposed that the angels are the disembodied spirits of men. This view, however, is contradicted by the remarkable passage recorded in Mark 12; 25, where the glorified saints are said to be like the angels: "For when they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven." Or as Luke has it, xx. 35, 36: "But they which shall be counted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

Here the distinction is clearly and distinctly stated; be-

cause resemblance necessarily excludes the idea of sameness. Nor have we any account in the Bible of the resurrection of angels. It would sound strange, indeed, to hear it said, that in the last day the angels that are in their graves shall hear the voice of God and come forth. No; these are the sons of God who shouted together for joy when God laid the foundations of the earth, Job xxxviii. 4, consequently before man was created. Accordingly too we are taught in Ps. viii. 5, that God made man a little lower than the angels. Compare Heb. ii. 7.

II. This leads us to consider the relative position, and employment of the angels.

They hold, it seems, an intermediate place, in the scale of being, between Christ and men.

Men are made lower than the angels, as we have just seen. Jesus too was made a little lower than they, "for the suffering of death." Heb. ii. 9. Yet he is preferred above the angels both in person and office. "Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." "For unto which of the angels said he at any time," "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?" "And again when he bringeth in the First-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him." Heb. i. 4–6. Here we are taught that Christ is God, and that the angels are worshippers, consequently creatures. The only inference left us then is, that, if they are a higher order of rational beings than man, specifically distinct from him (for Christ did not take on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham), they occupy an intermediate position. They are not omnipotent, yet they excel in strength, and are called "mighty angels." 2 Thess. i. 7. Ps. ciii. 20. They seem especially to gather around the second Person of the adorable Trinity. They behold the face of the Eternal "Father which is in heaven," as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Matt. xviii. 10.

"And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thou-

sands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory and blessing." Rev. v. 11, 12. They are interested in, and study into, the mystery of his person and work. "Which things the angels desire to look into." 1 Pet. i. 12. Hence in the vision of the ladder they are "*ascending* and descending." Heaven is their abode, but by men they are seen first where the mystery of the union of the divine nature with the human is revealed; hence first at the *foot* of the ladder. The true Israelites see the angels first *ascending* then descending on the Son of Man. In Bethlehem they are seen adoring the mystery of the incarnation; here they are heard singing: "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will toward men." The thousand of thousands who ministered unto him and stood before him whilst seated on his glorious throne in heaven came down to our earth when he took upon him the form of a servant to worship his veiled divinity as essentially the same as that which fills all heaven with its glory. They accompany him on his journey through life; they minister to his wants, they support him when faint, and defend him when in danger, as it was promised. "He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone." Ps. xci. 11, 12. Hence he says, to one of his disciples who is ready to use the sword for his defence: "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels." They are with him in the garden of Gethsemane, and when suspended on the cross,

'Around the bloody tree they press,
The wondrous sight to see,
The Lord of life expire.
And when arrayed in light
He left his dark abode
They haste in rapturous flight
Up to the throne of God;
They waved around their golden wings,
And struck their harps of sweetest strings."

And as these holy intelligences gather around the person of our Saviour, they are also interested in the extension of his

kingdom. They are sent to minister to the heirs of salvation.

In regard to the form of their ministry we have no definite information. From Luke xiv. 6, we may infer that they fill their ministerial office as remembrancers. The two angels, one at either end of the grave, said to the fearful disciples: "*Remember* how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying, the Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again." From this it appears that while the Saviour was instructing his disciples in Galilee the angels were present, and treasured up his words in their memories that they might remind the forgetful disciples of what they had heard. But the ministry of Christ is continued in his Church. Through his ministerial servants, through his ambassadors, he is constantly teaching his disciples, and they in turn teach others. May not the *angels* then be present wherever God's word is proclaimed, so as to be able to remind Christians in the hour of their trial. This idea of angelic presence seems to be conveyed by the apostle Paul in his sublime language to the Ephesians, iii. 10, "To the intent that now unto the *principalities* and *powers* in heavenly places might be known by the *Church* the manifold wisdom of God."

As we shall see presently the bad angels tempt the people of God to do evil; why then should not the good angels be employed to suggest good thoughts to their minds and encourage them to do good?

The idea of *guardian* angels is taken from the fact that they guarded and defended our Saviour; hence too they are employed to defend the members of his mystical body. These are as dear to Christ as the apple of his own eye, and the motive that he presents for not harming even the least one of these, is because their angels continually behold the face of their Father in heaven. The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him and delivereth them." Ps. xxxviii. 7. When the pious die the angels are employed to convey them to heaven. "And it came to pass that the beggar died and

was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom." Luke xvi. 22.

God employs the angels in the administration of justice and judgment. "The angel stretched out his hand upon Jerusalem to destroy it." 2 Sam. xxiv: 16. "The angel of the Lord smote in the camp of the Syrians a hundred four-score and five thousand." 2 Kings xix. 35. So they will be active in the final judgment. "The harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels." "The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire," &c. Matt. xiii. 39–41–42.

III. *The History of the Angels.* Here the question is simply whether or not they *have* a history. This follows as a consequence from the preceding. If angels are personal beings, as we have learned, and if they stand in organic connection with the created universe, then their life is necessarily historical. The organic in itself considered does not yet give us the idea of history. The vegetable and animal kingdoms, which are constantly unfolding their living powers around us, cannot be said to have a history; but the organic in the form of the *personal* must needs be historical. Here there is not only a development, but conscious development, not only an objective revelation but a subjective apprehension; not merely a succession of events, as they flow from a common life, but also an intelligent narration of said events; hence "*historein*" to tell us, to make known, to relate. The history of our world is but its developed life told, or related. So the history of the angels is but *their* developed life told, or related. What can we know about it? We must be content with general facts. Particular data cannot give us much trouble; for the obvious reason that they are not given.

We cannot tell for instance *when* the angels were created; hence we cannot tell how old the angelic world is. The *fact*, however, that they were created is clearly revealed. It is not revealed in Scripture that they were all created simultaneously, nor can we there learn that some are older than others; but it

is evident that their relation to one another is not generic; they were not born from a common angelic parentage; but directly from their common heavenly parent. For this reason they are a common brotherhood; they are "sons of God," held together as one family by a common life and a common bond of love. Their union is organic, though not generic. It has been conceived that because they are not generically united they cannot be in organic union, that as an order of rational beings they stand by themselves, without any living connection with the creation as a whole, and that each angel also stands by himself.

This conception is erroneous and finds its corrective in the unity of the creation. Even the idea of a mechanical union would exclude such a notion. Much more is it excluded by the idea of organic union. The idea of simultaneous birth does not exclude the idea of organic union. Twin brothers are flesh of the same flesh and bone of the same bone no less than those who are born into the world at successive periods. So the simultaneous birth of all the angelic hosts is no evidence that they are not all animated by the same heavenly life. Hence they are a fraternity—they are as said, "the sons of God," evidently made in his image. And if sons of God their creation was (like that of man) an actualization of the eternal idea of sonship as it is in his Only-begotten Son. *He* is the "*Prototokos*" of the angelic world as well as the human. In this is involved the truth that the angels were created in the image of God, as said; in righteousness and true holiness. They were created perfectible, but not perfect. With them, as with all rational creatures, righteousness and holiness must become habitual. Their love and worship of God must be from choice, free, voluntary. Otherwise it could not be acceptable. In such service, however, is involved the idea of *probation*, *trial*. That the commencement of the angelic life, as well as the human, was a probationary period, does not admit of a doubt. The choice of God's service implies the possibility of its opposite. Voluntary obedience implies the possibility of disobedience, and the very thought of such opposite

choice, or disobedience, is a temptation. The suggestion of such thought may be either from within or from without, or both. Whether or not there was any outward motive presented to the angelic mind for sinning against God we are not informed, nor does it belong properly to our subject to notice the various speculations that have been indulged in, with reference to the origin of evil. Its possibility, as actualized in fact, is all that belongs legitimately to our subject. Beyond the fact we need not *go* either for the proof of the possibility. A possibility need not be actualized, and hence does not prove a fact; but a fact necessarily implies its possibility. From the fact that some angels sinned and became apostate it is lawful to infer that it was possible for all to sin. And from the fact that some did not sin it is lawful to infer that the "posse non peccare" (the possibility not to sin) was present for all; *i. e.* they are free agents, and in the commencement of their history, to say the least, must have been in a state of probation.

To suppose that their life developed normally for a time without trial, and that they were placed in a probationary state *subsequently*, is by no means as philosophical as the opinion that the beginning of their history, like that of our first parents, was their great trial.

Now when we are met by the question: why did some continue, and develop, in holiness, whilst others became disobedient and fell from their first estate? the only answer we can give is; because, in this way the two classes respectively saw fit to exercise that freedom of will, that power to choose the good or the evil, with which the Creator endowed them. But why one class should choose a normal life, and the other class its opposite whilst in the same holy state of being, under the influence of the same holy motives, we cannot tell. That sin should originate in heaven among the holy angels, in God's immediate presence, is a "gordian knot," which, to the best of our knowledge, has never been untied. All we know is that it was possible, that the possibility lay in the nature of the personal creature, and that it was actualized in a fearful apostasy.

As there are evidently lower and higher orders of angels, we may suppose that their general society is governed by different hierarchs, all under the supreme control of Christ, "who is head over all things." It is only on this supposition that we can at all account for the existence of the two classes of angels spoken of in Scripture, the good and the bad.

The hypothesis of Dr. Dick and others will hardly hold, viz.: that each angel stands by himself and is committed to his own care, and is to stand or fall according to his personal conduct. "The only effect," it is said, "which one could have upon another, was by example and counsel, and excitation to good or evil." . . "The individuality of the moral agency of angels, if I may speak so, is manifest from the fact, that while some revolted, others maintained their allegiance. Hence arises a new subject of speculation. It does not appear that the apostasy of angels was successive, or that some apostatized at one time and others at another, but we have some reason to believe that the revolt was simultaneous. How then was the concurrence of a multitude obtained?" The same author supposes it was obtained by a few, who had sinned first, enticing others as Eve enticed Adam. This is not a likely tale, that such sinners should be permitted to remain long enough in heaven to entice so great a multitude to unite in a rebellion against the God of infinite love.

The other view is much more credible, viz., that the apostasy was simultaneous on the ground of an organic union as represented by a hierarch. So too in regard to the allegiance of the holy angels. Individualism, in the sense of the school referred to, had no place among them. There was, of course, a personal responsibility, but only as the personal holds in the organic union to which it belongs. As "no man liveth to himself," so no angel liveth to himself. Hence we read of "Michael and *his* angels," and the "Dragon and *his* angels." Rev. xii. 7. The expression the "Devil and his angels is quite common," implying headship, hierarchy.

We are here then confronted with two orders of angelic life, the one normal and the other abnormal.

The difference between them we say, implies a period of probation or trial at the very commencement of the angelic history. The temptation to which the "devil and his angels" yielded, whatever may have been its nature or its form, was no doubt, common to *all* the angels, and was resisted by those who maintained their integrity. In this resistance and in the free choice of God's service their holiness, in which they were created, became habitual; they became more and more confirmed in it, and less and less exposed to the danger of sinning. How long the process continued until they reached the ultimate *status confirmationis* from which it is morally impossible to fall we cannot ascertain. Some think it is still possible for the holy angels to sin and fall, and others entertain the opinion that they were fully confirmed in the good, so as to be beyond the reach of all danger, immediately after the first trial. The latter opinion, we think, is more plausible than the former. We cannot well conceive of a second revolt of angels in heaven, or of a second apostasy. Newly created angels might fall on their first trial, but after their life becomes habitually holy we conceive that their fall is as impossible as that of the glorified saints. The old world of holy angels stands secure, and will forever stand to the praise and glory of the great Creator. It will not even be affected by the "general wreck of matter and crush of worlds." It will stand after the natural "heavens shall have passed away with a great noise," and after "the elements shall have been melted with fervent heat." Between it and the old world of fallen angels there is an impassable gulf fixed. The holy angels cannot become unholy, and the unholy can never become holy.

Of the relation of the former to the human world we have already spoken; it remains yet to speak more particularly of the "devil and his angels" and their relation to the children of men.

Of the noble origin of his majesty nothing more need be said. He was created an angel of superior rank. Some think he was the highest of all the angels; hence the immense depth of his fall in consequence of his sin. There has been much

speculation in regard to the particular nature of that crime wh ichexpelled him from heaven. Some say it was jealousy or envy ; it is thought that he became jealous even of Christ. The most common tradition is that his sin was that of pride. Hence the expression, "Proud as Lucifer." Like the sin of our first parents it has been resolved into that of unbelief, as this is the root of all sin. We can help ourselves best to the true idea in the case by ascertaining the import of his most unholy name.

There are many names given him in Scripture, but their significations are all gathered up into one. He is called the Serpent, Gen. iii. 1, the Old Serpent, Rev. xii. 9. The Red Dragon, Rev. xii. 3. The Accuser of the brethren, Rev. xii. 10. The enemy, Matt. xii. 39; Satan, Job i.; Zach. iii. 1, 2; Belial, 2 Cor. vi. 15; Beelzebub, Matt. xii. 24; Mammon, The Angel of the Bottomless Pit, Rev. ix. 11. The prince of the power of the air, Eph. ii. 2. Lucifer, Isa. xiv. 12. Abaddon, or Apollyon, Rev. ix. 11. Legion, Mark v. 9. The god of this world, 2 Cor. iv. 4. The Foul spirit, Mark ix. 25. The Unclean spirit, Mark i. 27. The Lying spirit, 2 Chron. xxx. The Tempter, Matt. iv. 3. He is also called a liar and the father of lies. He is in fact called everything that is bad. But all that is bad in the names thus far mentioned, and we might add all the bad that is, or can be imagined, is included in the name *Devil.* This is his common and most appropriate New Testament name. Nor is it a slander to call him at any time by this name. What is its import? According to the etymology of the word, *διαβολος*, it means thrown across. The idea is that of a personal being who throws his will, with all its weight, across the will of God, or lifts it up in rebellion against God. This is sin, which is destruction. Whatever form it may take, whether of unbelief, pride, deceit, enmity, hate, or falsehood, it is the same in its nature; hence the meaning of the word Devil, in plain English, is "The Destroyer" (see Pool on the Acts). A devil is a destroyer. But now we are speaking of *the* Devil, and we must try and give him his due. Here as elsewhere divines have made bad work by reasoning in

the abstract. By some indeed the Devil is regarded as a mere creature of the imagination, a sort of figurative personification of evil; others view him as the greatest of sinners in the universe, but as standing by himself, having no concrete connection with other fallen angels, each one of whom is again viewed as a smaller devil standing by himself. They are confederated only by a sort of immoral bond for a wicked purpose. They are conceived of as an army of locusts, or grasshoppers, combining their forces for the destruction of every moral plant in the vast field of personal being. But here the question of Dr. Dick will again arise, "how could the consent of so great a multitude be obtained for such a diabolical purpose?" Or we may put in a question of our own: why is it, on this theory of acccidental combination, or agregation rather, that they do not fall out among themselves? Why does not Milton in marshalling them on the ethereal planes to make battle against the angelic hosts of heaven, and the sacramental hosts of God's elect on earth, throw them into confusion and make them destroy themselves? Though his poetry is not theology, his theological instinct was too good nevertheless to commit so great a blunder as this. It is felt by him, as it is in the Christian consciousness generally, though not clearly perceived, that the devil and his angels are a power for evil in a vastly different sense. As said, there is a common angelic life. So we must conceive that there is a common life of fallen angels, or a common abnormal angelic life, individualized, of course; yet so that the individual holds in the general, whilst this again is in the form of the countless multitude of individuals, under the leadership of one grand chief. This is The Devil of the New Testament. He is a real objective personal entity; but not a single individual by himself; he is Legion. This is the name which he gave himself; he said: "My name is Legion, for we are many:" Mark v. 9. In this instance the infernal liar spoke the truth, and thus proved himself to be a better theologian than the modern divines who speak learnedly of evil in the abstract, only occasionally making a polite bow to his Satanic majesty to win a smile of approbation. He knows they

are onhis side, though they know it not. *No*, NO! Evil is concrete, hence a fearful reality. The abnormal angelic life in legion form is not a mere voluntary combination; this it is; but it is vastly more. It is the *real* personification of all that is evil. This, we repeat, is the real objective Devil of the New Testament. Hence, as a certain author says, who withholds his name, "Nay, all the mischiefs he is empowered to do, are in the Scripture placed to his account, under the particular title of the Devil, not of devils in the plural number, though they are sometimes mentioned too; but in the singular, it is the identical individual Devil, *in* and under whom all the little Devils, and all the great Devils if such there be, are supposed to act, nay they are supposed to be governed and directed by him. Thus we are told in Scripture of the works of the Devil, 1 John iii. 8; of casting out the Devil, Mark i. 34; of resisting the Devil, James iv. 7; of our Saviour being tempted of the Devil, Matt. iv. 1; of Simon Magus a child of the Devil. The Devil came down in great wrath, Rev. xii. 12, and the like."

Thus we are brought to the inquiry: what is the relation of the fallen angels, whose abnormal life is under the control and command of this *real* personal hierarch to the human family?

Before entering upon this mysterious part of our subject it is important to recollect what we have gained from the past. We have learned that the created universe is organic, that as the whole sustains a vital relation to the fountain of all life, so all the parts sustain a vital relation to each other. We have learned that the general relation of the creature to the Creator holds in His Son through the Holy Spirit. We have learned that the union and communion of the different parts of nature are not opposed to their specific difference, that on the contrary diversity grounds itself in unity. We have learned that the creation as a whole is complete in the personal creature, and that this again is complete in the ideal Person, the Son of God, who is the brightness of the Father's glory and the *express* image of *His* Person. We have learned that the personal creature, man, and the personal creatures, the angels,

were made in the same Divine image, and that consequently in their normal state they are in the same communion, notwithstanding their specific difference. They are one family. We have learned finally that the fallen angels, in consequence of their normal life having become abnormal, are in unholy league with one another, that their entire life is *really* personified in their hierarch, the devil.

From all this taken together, and especially from the last, it follows as a natural consequence, that if human life becomes abnormal it is actually in communion with the devil and his angels. This we know it has become in fact, and there is no doctrine revealed more fully in God's Holy Word than this, viz.: human nature as affected by sin is under Satan's dominion. This doctrine too is just as philosophical as it is scriptural. If in the universe of God there is a union and communion of the good, good things, good men and good angels, why in the name of common sense and in the name of truth, should there not be a communion of the evil, since evil has originated? What is the bad, the evil, but the self-perverted good, the διαβολος, (the devil)? And in what communion can we find it if it be not in communion with itself? This is the destroying principle, and the devil in whom it is embodied, is emphatically the destroyer.

Sin was *his* fall and destruction; hence he is called a "murderer" from the beginning. He was the instigator of the sin committed by our first parents, which was their fall and the fall of their posterity. When they sinned they were led captive by the will of Satan. When they yielded to the temptation they yielded to Satan's power. In not doing God's will they did the will of the devil; they accepted him as their king.

When they left the communion of God and the holy angels in heaven, by their disobedience, they entered the communion of the fallen angels; and if man continues in that communion while he lives on earth, he must remain in it in the eternal world, "Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." Why so? Why should bad men be closed up with the bad angels in the world to come if there be no affinity between them, or want of affinity for the good, to say

the least. In the whole universe there are but two communions, the good and the bad, and they who are not in the good must needs be in the bad. For this obvious reason, throughout the entire Bible, unregenerated humanity and unregenerated or wicked men are spoken of as being in the kingdom of Satan and of darkness. We are bound to believe the Saviour and Apostles on this subject. Christ says emphatically, Jno. xiv.: 30: "Hereafter I will not talk much with you; for the *prince* of this world cometh and hath nothing in Me." The Apostle Paul in 2 Cor. iv. 4, calls Satan the god of this world: "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not." Eph. ii. 2: "Wherein in times past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air; the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." Eph. vi. 12: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. 1 Jno. iii. 8: "He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning."

Such declarations as these are too plain to be misunderstood. Neither Christ nor the Apostles have the least conception of sin or evil in the abstract, or as existing only in man apart from Satanic influence. They declare facts as they hold in the concrete. "The god of this world!" "The prince of this world!" What is the meaning of such expressions? Does not the "World" here mean, in distinction from the kingdom of the Saviour's grace, the whole of humanity sold under sin. Who is its god? who is its prince? The answer has been given. Satan is the god of this world, except so far as regenerated by the Spirit of God. There is no sin in the world without Satan, neither hereditary sin nor actual sin. It was once said: "No Christ no Church," no Church no Christ; the union between them being mystical. May we not say here: "No devil no sin, no sin no devil. This may be said of sin as such, original as well as actual sin. Try as we may to force the distinction between the two into a separation, they are after all in

principle the same. Original sin is actual sin in germ, and the actual sin is the original sin developed. The god of this world is the god of abnormal humanity in every stage of its existence from the mystery of conception and birth to the more awful mystery of death. Satan works in the children of disobedience, as we have just been told by the Apostle. What consummate nonsense to admit the depravity of infants and to deny that they are under the power of the devil! All such abstract notions must lead to confusion, if not to downright infidelity.

No; as said before, there are but two communions: the one of the good and the other of the evil; the one of light and the other of darkness; the one of Christ and the other of Belial. 2 Cor. vi. 12: "So this truth has been held in the consciousness of the Christian Church in every period of her history. In her consciousness the conflict is all the time between the seed of the woman (Christ) and the serpent. When the power of the serpent shall be destroyed, then humanity will be redeemed. So it holds in the consciousness of our branch of the Church. "Our comfort in life and death is that Christ has fully satisfied for all our sins and delivered us from all the power of the devil." By bringing home to himself the meaning of this expression, the veriest boy can satisfy himself of its orthodoxy. True the full satisfaction for sin by the blood of Christ is one thing, and deliverance from all the power of the devil is another; but are they held apart in the Christian consciousness? Or do they hold in their concrete union? Does not every Christian feel and know that his salvation from sin is his deliverance from the power of the devil? And does he not feel too that his deliverance from the power of the devil is his salvation from sin? In other words, does not the Christian feel and know that sin is the power of the devil? Is not sin whether original or actual, the devil's work? Will any Christian deny that it is his spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience? Here the Christian consciousness is orthodox, whilst certain modern divines are afraid to be either orthodox or Pelagian. Afraid of the truth lest too much might be made of our Lord's holy sacraments and Church, and ashamed of Pelagian error lest the devil himself might be slandered.

This then being settled that there is a communion of evil on the ground of an abnormally organic union of the devil and his angels with depraved and fallen humanity, it is easily seen why it is that *all* sin, whatever may be the forms of its manifestation, is put down to the account of the devil as its author. The history of our world's sin is but the history of the devil's work. Not that this makes the guilt of man less by any means; as we shall see in the sequel, it rather makes it the greater.

For man voluntarily to enter the communion of the devil, to do his will, to imitate his example and actually to become assimilated to his character, whilst it is his blessed privilege to enter the other communion with God, the holy angels, the saints and actually to become like God, is certainly to involve himself in the deepest crime, so that we can truly say to him: "Thou art inexcusable, O man, that doest such things." He is guilty just because he becomes diabolos with the chief of devils, throwing his will with that of all the diaboloi across the will of God.

Every sin committed by man is but a repetition of Satan's sin. All abnormal or sinful human life is but the outspreading of the devil's abnormal life. Hence sinful men are called in God's Word, emphatically the children of the devil. "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." Jno. viii. 44. This declares a unity of evil life, of purpose and will. Why God permits evil to exist in our world we are not told. Why this common enemy of man should be permitted to go about on the face of the earth like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour, remains one of the sealed mysteries. It has been supposed that sin has been permitted to abound in our world that grace might much more abound. This suggestion was made to the mind of an inspired Apostle; but he shudders at the thought. We must be content with the fact that evil exists, that Satan has his empire, that the depth of human sin is Satan's depth.

It is a comfort to know that his power is not unlimited. He is a creature though evidently stronger than man, having many principalities and powers at his command. Furthermore he is said to be reserved in chains until the final judgment. Yet it

seems he has liberty to roam abroad on the earth and to effect his diabolical purposes.

It seems in the time of Christ certain persons were really possessed of the devil. This is remarkable. There seems to be a certain coincidence between the Satanic development up to this point of the world's history, and the Jewish History by which humanity is prepared in a positive way for the Incarnation. As the way was preparing for four thousand years for the advent of our Lord, it appears that Satan was working himself more and more deeply into human nature; so that when Christ becomes incarnate the devil is also in his hellish way incarnate. It was not enough that he should be the tyrant, the god of this world, and that as Belial he should have his idolatrous worship of all the heathen; when Christ comes in the regular line of promise, he as the arch-enemy of man, must also be in Judea, on holy ground, to destroy, if possible, the infant Saviour; and when he cannot succeed, he would also be incarnate. He would take real possession of man and beast. He entered certain persons and also the swine.

Hence there are instances recorded of certain persons really being devils, and of some being possessed of the devil. "Chosen twelve and one of you is a devil." John vi. 70. But in this sense all who are like-minded with Judas are devils. All the children of the wicked one are diaboloi. As the world stood in the Saviour's day and as it now stands there is nothing extraordinary in this. But the cases of real possession recorded in the New Testament are special cases. Math. xvii. 18: "And Jesus rebuked the devil, and he departed out of him."

Mark v. 15: "Him that was possessed with the devil." vii. 29: "The devil is gone out of thy daughter." The instances are numerous.

The only question with which we have to do is: were the possessions *real?* The Christian faith demands an affirmative answer. To say that diseases are here called devils is to do violence to the obvious meaning of the Saviour. He healed many diseases, but they are always called by their appropriate names. Christ healed diseases *and* cast out devils.

All nations have had some idea of demoniacal possessions, and we have no right to say that there may not be such in every age of the world and even in our day. The instances recorded in the New Testament of demoniacal possessions and of Christ casting out the devil, shows that Christ is the rightful sovereign of humanity and that Satan is a usurper. It shows too that the design of Christ was to redeem humanity from the power of sin and Satan and finally exterminate him from the earth.

The whole subject of the habitation of the fallen angels, especially their final habitation is difficult. The Scriptures tell us it will be hell. But where hell is we cannot tell. The earth and the heavens will be taken up in the new creation. This will be all radiant with celestial light and glory, from which the wicked angels and finally wicked men must be excluded. They must be cast out into outer darkness. It is set forth in Scripture in the use of the most awful figures: "The bottomless pit," "Lake of fire," "The everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels."

The word "*prepared*" signifies an abode. As the earth was prepared as a suitable abode for man, so hell, the everlasting fire, was prepared for the devil and his angels.

ART. II.—THE RELATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT TO THE NEW.

BY REV. J. M. TITZEL, A.M., EMMITTSBURG, MD.

Immediately after man's woful fall from a state of innocence and happiness into one of guilt and misery, God set before him the glorious hope of redemption, in the gracious promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. This promise, however, was not at once fulfilled. Between its first annunciation and the actual coming of the promised seed, long ages intervened; and, since then, ages again have passed away, and yet is not the power of the serpent wholly destroyed. But, during the whole of man's history, God has been with him, working out his deliverance. From the time of the fall, until the actual appearance of the seed of the woman, He carried forward this great work of love among men, under the Old Testament dispensation; and, since then, He has continued to do so under the New. Yet, in these two dispensations, He has not come to men and revealed Himself to them in precisely the same way. Although both are parts of one grand scheme of redemption, and, consequently, in some respects alike, yet in other respects they differ very widely; and it is of the utmost importance, therefore, to the correct understanding of either of them, that there should be a proper conception of the relation in which they stand the one to the other.

That the two Revelations under consideration are, in some respects, similar, is apparent from the fact that in both, the parties concerned are the same. It is God who reveals Himself, and man to whom He reveals Himself, in the Old Testament as well as in the New. They are both alike in this, therefore, that they are both really a revelation of God to man.

Of the profound truths which are made known in the Old Testament, man could never have attained any knowledge by the mere development of his reason. The unfolding of no innate powers which he possesses, would ever have enabled him to discover the history of creation, or the true character of God and of His laws. The Jewish worship and polity were not such as man himself, in his fallen state, could have originated. Of all this, the history of the heathen world affords us ample proof. The origin of the universe engaged the speculations of the ancient philosophers for ages; yet, at the end of their labors, they were no nearer the solution of the problem of creation than when they began. Then, between their views of God and their forms of worship and those of God's covenant people, under the Old Testament dispensation, there was all the difference between heaven and earth. While the religion of the latter manifested the most wondrous adaptedness to the true wants of man's spiritual being, that of the former, throughout, was unsatisfying and even degrading. Compared with Jehovah and His worship, the gods of Olympus were, indeed, most miserable caricatures of Deity, and their sacred rites but poorly calculated to promote the true happiness and glory of their votaries.

But not only would it have been impossible for man, of himself, to have attained to a knowledge of the truths made known in the Old Testament, but, also, to have reached the perfection of being to which the Old Testament saints attained. The life of Abraham, of Moses, of David, of Elijah, and of other worthies of Israel, was not the mere result of the innate powers and tendencies of their hearts and minds. Of themselves, they could never have become what they were, or adorned their lives with so many and so great virtues. Their faith in God, and their devotion to the cause of truth and righteousness, were the result of a divine influence operating upon them through the Old Testament Revelation. This is, unquestionably, evident from the fact, that only such persons as enjoyed the benefits of this Revelation, manifested, in the same way, the virtues to which allusion has been made. In none of the contemporary heathen sages and philosophers, do we find similar faith and devotion.

What has just been remarked of the Old Testament Revelation, it is scarcely necessary to say, is equally true as regards the New Testament. It also makes known truths which it would have been impossible for man, of himself, to have discovered; and carries with it, for all those who receive it, the power of a supernatural, divine life. This, the Revelation itself, as well as history, both sacred and profane, abundantly proves. No one, indeed, who carefully reads the New Testament, can fail, unless he be incapable of receiving the truth, to perceive in it manifold evidences of its divine origin and character. Then, the history of the Christian Church clearly shows, as every one who candidly and honestly studies it must feel, that Christianity is the product not of mere nature, but of a divine power at work in humanity.

But not only in the respect now considered, are the Revelation of the Old Testament and that of the New similar; but, also, as regards the general object for which they have been given. Both look to the deliverance of man from the power of sin and death, and the bringing of him to the full consummation of his being. Though man, as he came from the hands of his Creator, was good, yet was he not at once made actually all that he was designed to become. Before he could reach the complete perfection of his being, it was necessary that he should pass through a process of development. This, through divine assistance, he would have done in a perfectly normal way, and without any violent crisis in his history, if he had remained true to his Maker and to himself. But, through his disobedience in the garden of Eden, he deprived himself of the divine favor and assistance which he enjoyed, and rendered himself incapable of normal development toward the true end of his life. In order that he might reach this, it was necessary, therefore, that he should be delivered from the power of sin and death, to which he had subjected himself, and that the divine favor and assistance which he had lost in the fall, should be restored to him again. Now, the object of the Old Testament, as well as of the New, is to furnish just this needed aid and deliverance. And that this really is the object of both Revelations, is clearly

taught in the Scriptures themselves. Thus, in the Psalms, we read: "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to Thy words. * * * Thou, through Thy commandments, hast made me wiser than mine enemies; for they are ever with me. I have more understanding than all my teachers; for Thy testimonies are my meditation. I understand more than the ancients, because I keep Thy precepts. * * * Through Thy precepts I get understanding; therefore, I hate every false way." (Ps. cxix.) And St. Paul, in his Second Epistle to Timothy, writes: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.) That the object of both Revelations is what has been stated, is also evident from the effects produced by their operations on the minds and hearts of men. Their invariable tendency is to lead those who come truly under their influence, to avoid sin, and to walk in the ways of truth and righteousness. The purest, noblest, and holiest men of all ages, have ever been found among the number of those over whom the Revelations of the Old and New Testaments have exerted a profound and controlling power.

But while the Old and New Testaments are one, as regards their source and ultimate object, yet, as has been already stated, in other respects they are quite unlike each other. The form of Revelation is not the same in both. God manifested Himself to His chosen people, under the Old Testament dispensation, differently from what He does under the New. He is present in the latter as He was not in the former. The outward, visible manifestation in the pillar of cloud and of fire, which went before Israel during their wanderings through the wilderness, and, as the shekinah, rested on the wings of the cherubim over the mercy-seat in the tabernacle and in the temple, has been superseded by the inward, invisible presence in the power of a new, divine life, while the bloody rites and sacrifices of the earlier dispensation have given place to the blood-

less ordinances of the later, and the restricted favors of the Old have made room for the all-embracing mercy of the New.

Throughout the Scripture record of the two Revelations, indeed, a manifest difference between them is recognized and taught. The one is continually represented as *outward*, *shadowy* and *preparatory*, while the other is declared to be *inward*, *substantial* and *fulfilling*. Thus, in Jeremiah, we read: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which My covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord: but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord, I will put My law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be My people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord: for they shall all know Me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." (Jer. xxxi. 31–34.) In the Epistle to the Colossians, we are plainly told of the ordinances of the earlier Revelation, that "they are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ" (Col. ii. 17); and in the Epistle to the Galatians, it is just as plainly declared, that "the law was our schoolmaster, to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith" (Gal. iii. 24); while the chief object of the Gospel, according to St. Matthew, is to prove that Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it.

Here, however, the question arises, In what sense is the Old Testament *outward*, *shadowy*, and *preparatory*, and the New *inward*, *substantial*, and *fulfilling?* And this is an all-important question, inasmuch as these terms may be, and indeed are, variously understood. Unless, therefore, we determine definitely and correctly their meaning, as applied to the Rev-

elations under consideration, we shall only delude ourselves in supposing that they convey to us any real knowledge.

In the current theology of the day, these distinctions are generally recognized and taught. The only sense, however, in which many understand the Old Testament to be *outward*, and the New *inward*, is this, that in the former, many outward rites and ceremonies were required to be observed, while in the latter, the main stress is laid on subjective acts of faith and feeling. *Shadowy* and *substantial* are understood by the same persons to signify merely that the ordinances of the Old Testament were purely of a typical character, signifying what was to take place, whereas, those of the New continually refer us to what has been already accomplished, and is of full force without them. The Old Testament, at the same time, is supposed to have prepared the way for the New very much in the same manner as a teacher, by his earlier instructions, prepares the way for his students to apprehend and understand his subsequent teachings. It is preparatory, in other words, as presenting the simpler truths concerning God and man, without a knowledge of which it would have been utterly impossible for men ever to have grasped the truths finally made known by Christ.

At first thought, all this seems to be very plausible and satisfactory. Yet it requires but very little consideration of the subject to be convinced that in reality it is the very reverse. That the Old Testament dispensation abounded in outward rites and ceremonies, is unquestionable; but it is equally unquestionable, that these rites and ceremonies were not appointed to be performed without a corresponding state of heart and mind. The true Israelite was not a person who, in a merely outward way, attended to the ordinances of his religion, but one who did so in a proper spirit. In the Old Testament, the outward act was never designed to be separated from the inward motion of the heart, but both were to go together. So, also, in the New Testament, the outward and the inward are always united. The truly Christian man abounds not only in subjective experiences of holy feelings but, also, in corres-

ponding holy acts. The faith that saves, is the faith that works by love. The worship which is well-pleasing to God, consists not merely in reverential emotions, but in the outward expression of such emotions. "Pure religion and undefiled, before God and the Father, is this: To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." (James i. 27.) Thus, we find that so far as the union of spirit and form in acts of worship is concerned, there is no difference between the Old Testament and the New. In both, the two are required to go together, and neither is of any real value or force separated from the other. As the letter, without the spirit, is dead, so, also, may the spirit, without the letter, be said, in some sense, to be dead, or at least powerless, in either dispensation. But what now comes of the common way of understanding the terms *outward* and *inward*, as characterizing the two Revelations whose relation we are considering? Either both words mean the same, or else they mean merely that, in the former Revelation, more sacred rites were commanded to be observed than there are in the latter. Thus, these words would indicate only a difference in degree, between the two Revelations. So, also, the other words mentioned as designating, respectively, the character of the Old and the New Testament.

But, surely, the words, *outward* and *inward*, *shadow* and *substance*, *preparation* and *fulfilment*, cannot properly be used to signify a mere difference in degree. They, unquestionably, imply, if they mean any thing at all, a difference in kind. And such, really, the Scriptures, throughout, teach the difference between the Old Testament and the New to be. Thus, in the former, we are continually reminded that it is not complete in itself, but that it is to be superseded by something higher, to which all its rites and ordinances look; while in the latter, we are just as continually reminded that it is the final revelation, and that, through it, is supplied all that man needs, in order to the perfection of his being. Moreover, the New Testament clearly teaches that complete redemption from the power of sin and death is possible only through a life-union

with the risen and ascended Saviour, who "learned obedience by the things which He suffered; and, being made perfect, became the author of eternal salvation" (Heb. v. 8, 9); and that this union is effected through the Holy Ghost, who came only after Christ's glorification, and who, consequently, was not present, under the Old Testament dispensation, as "the Lord, the Giver of life" in the highest and fullest sense. Jesus, Himself, emphatically declared, "Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven, is greater than he." (Math. xi. 11.) And the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews as positively asserts, with regard to the worthies of the faith of the Old Testament, that "these all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better things for us, that they, without us, should not be made perfect." (Heb. xi. 39, 40.) If these words mean any thing at all, they must mean that the difference between the two Revelations we are considering is very wide and marked, and that, though the Old Testament saints "had the subjective longing for the promised salvation, and subjective faith in it, yet they had not the real objective regeneration, the germ of a new life, proceeding from the exalted Christ, which is implanted in us by baptism, and is nourished in the holy sacrament of the Supper." (Ebrard on Heb., xi. 39, 40.)

But while we must carefully avoid the common error of ignoring the real difference between the Old Testament and the New, we must also be careful not to make the difference between the two so broad as to exclude Christ and the Holy Ghost from having any real connection with the former. For, though neither was active under the Old Testament dispensation as He is under the New, yet both were present; and this, in a most profound sense. It was Christ who, as the Angel of the Lord, appeared unto Moses in the burning bush—who went before Israel in the pillar of cloud and of fire during their wanderings in the wilderness; was their Champion, Guide and Ruler, and dwelt with them as their peculiar treasure and por-

tion; and it was the Holy Ghost who moved the prophets to speak, and strove continually with the rebellious hearts of the chosen people.

The question, however, here meets us: What was the nature of this presence of Christ and of the Holy Ghost? or, we may say simply, of Christ? for, if the nature of His presence be understood, we shall not have so much difficulty in determining that of the Holy Ghost, since it pertains to Him to take of the things of Christ and show them to us. It is scarcely necessary to say this question is, in the discussion in which we are engaged, the question on which the whole subject hinges. We shall now endeavor to present some thoughts in the way of answer to it.

And, in so doing, we would first of all direct attention to the following statements of Scripture: "God created man in His own image; in the image of God created He him." (Gen i. 27.) "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature; for by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist." (Col. i. 15–17.) "That in the dispensation of the fullness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in Him." (Eph. i. 10.)

From these, and other statements of similar import, contained in the Scripture records, we infer that the image in which God created man, was the image of His Son, who was to become incarnate; and that, consequently, there must have been present to the mind of God, at the creation of man, the image of Christ, and that this image was the archetype according to which man was made. If this inference be correct, and we have every reason to believe it to be so, then the Incarnation did not originate with the conditions of redemption, but would have taken place even if man had not fallen. The Word was made flesh not merely because of sin, but because in this way alone the Ideal of humanity could be realized: sin neces-

sitated only suffering and death. The nature of man, consequently, is not something foreign to the nature of the Son of God, but, in its very creation, was designed for union and communion with it; in other words, man was made for union and communion with God in Christ. And at the very beginning of his existence, man began to actualize such relation, as is evident from what is told us in the Scriptures with regard to him and God in the Garden of Eden. Nor did the disobedience of our first parents, as subsequent history proves, wholly destroy this relation, and make its complete actualization impossible. The correspondence between God and man was, by the Fall, only put on a different footing from what it had been in the beginning; and it was made necessary, that man's nature should be redeemed, before he could be perfected and made meet for an inheritance in heaven, through union with Him who is the head of all principality and power. When, therefore, in the fullness of time Christ came, He came to "His own," and though "His own received Him not, yet as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." (John i. 11–13).

If what has now been stated, however, be true, then it follows that Christ's presence, under the Old Testament dispensation, was not merely an official and representative presence, as is frequently maintained, but a real life presence. He was with Israel, not simply as a Guide and Teacher, but as one who sustained a most intimate relation to their inmost life, and in whom their life alone found its proper significance. And this, also, we think, the whole history of redemption teaches. When the Word became flesh, He did not take upon Himself a nature merely like to that of man in every respect, but He was born of a woman. According to the flesh, He was the son of David, the offspring of Jesse, the seed of Abraham, and could trace His lineage back to Adam, and, through him, to God. From Eve, "the mother of all living," down through the ages to the Virgin Mary, "blessed among women," His body was being

prepared for Him. Its preparation began in the womb of the whole race; but, as the race more and more wandered away from God, it was confined within the narrower limits of Judaism, and finally reached its consummation in the person of the "highly-favored" Virgin, the culminating blossom of the garden of the whole Old Testament dispensation. All this is clearly proved by the genealogical tables given us in the Scriptures. Nor can we suppose that the Son of God was not, in any real way, united to His body while it was thus being made ready for Him. We are, as it were, instinctively led to the opposite conclusion. It is, indeed, only on the ground of such union, and of Christ's consequent, continuous coming through the whole period of the Old Testament, that we can account for the care with which the genealogy of our Lord has been preserved and traced.

But, though there was a continuous coming of Christ in Judaism, yet was there no full actual coming until Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea. Then only was a complete union between God and man effected, and a proper occasion given for the multitude of the heavenly host to sing, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men." The actual coming, however, it may be well here to state, does not stand related to the continuous, which preceded it, as the ripened fruit does to the growing, but, rather, as the higher kingdoms of nature stand related to the lower. Somewhat as the vegetable kingdom, for instance, prepared the way for the animal, so did Christ's continuous coming, in the earlier dispensation, prepare the way for his actual coming in the fullness of time. Or, to make use of an illustration suggested by the writings of St. Paul, humanity may be said to have been betrothed to Christ in the Old Testament, but to be actually married to Him in the New Testament. Though both are parts of one grand, organic scheme of redemption, yet is not Christianity a mere development of Judaism, but, in the true sense of the term, a new creation. And hence, as has been already stated, the saints of the Old Testament stood in a very different relation to God from that in which we, of the New Testament,

stand. They were united to Christ, but not united, as we are, to Him as the actual God-man; for He had not then yet been born of the Virgin. The Holy Ghost was with them, and wrought in them, but not, as in our case, as the Comforter, for as such He had not yet come; nor as the Spirit of the glorified Christ, for Christ was not then yet glorified. The actual forgiveness of sins, and the actual power of a divinely-perfected life, these belonged not to them as they do to us. But when we say this, we would not be understood to affirm that the condition of the departed worthies of the earlier dispensation continues to be an inferior one. On the contrary, we believe that the work of Christ, in its consequences, reached into the world of departed spirits, and changed the condition of those there, so that the worthies of the Old Testament who died in the faith, enjoy now the same blessings as those of the New Testament who sleep in Jesus. And we believe thus, we would here add, not without reason, inasmuch as the Scriptures do not represent mankind as a number of independent individuals, but as an organic whole, in which the dead and the living form but one body, so that the condition of the one may be affected by the other. And that this is the case, is clearly taught in that passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews to which we have referred already, and in which it is asserted that the faithful of the Old Testament "without us should not be made perfect" (Heb. xi. 40); as well as in that remarkable passage in the Book of Revelation, in which the fulfilling of the desire of the martyr spirits under the altar before the throne of God (Rev. vi. 9—11) is made to depend on the fulfilling of God's purpose in regard to the living.

Having now briefly considered the way in which the Old and New Testaments stand related to Christ, we are prepared, in some measure, to understand and define in what sense the former is, *outward*, *shadowy* and *preparatory;* and the latter, *inward*, *substantial*, and *fulfilling*. And from what has been said we learn that the Old Testament was not *outward*, because Christ was not present in it in any real way, or because its ordinances were mere empty or dead forms, but because under it the requirements of the law of God were not truly satisfied,

and the Ideal of humanity was not, and could not be, realized. As the Court of the Temple was *outward* relative to the sanctuary, so was the Old Testament relative to the New. In it God, indeed, held communication with men, but He did not manifest Himself unto them in all His fullness and glory. On the other hand, the New Testament is not *inward* because it has no outward forms—for it has these, as well as the Old Testament had,—or because it has to do merely with subjective experiences; but because it brings men into the most intimate,—actual union with God, through His only begotten and well-beloved Son, "in whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins" (Eph. i. 7), and by whom the Ideal of humanity has been realized and made actual. It is *inward*, because in it we have fellowship with the Father and the Son (1 John i. 3), and may "be partakers of the divine nature" (2 Pet. i. 4).

In the same way the Old Testament was not *shadowy*, because its rites and ceremonies carried no power in them, but because they continually pointed to something higher than that which they themselves conveyed to those who engaged in them. It was an adumbration of what has come after it, and has taken its place, as the blossom is an adumbration of the succeeding fruit. And the New Testament is *substantial*, in that it brings to us the Fountain of all life and blessedness, so that in it we have to do, not merely with the types of heavenly things, but with the heavenly realities themselves. Under its gracious dispensation we are truly "come unto Mount Zion and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling which speaketh better things than that of Abel" (Heb. xii. 22–24).

As regards the preparation in the Old Testament for the New, this was not merely in the way of instruction, but rather in the way of culture. As the husbandman transplants the wild fruit tree from the open field in which he finds it, into his

garden, and prunes and tends it, that he may in due time graft it, so did God under the Old Testament deal with men. The manner in which this culture was thus carried on was two-fold. First, by the law, as an outward commandment demanding absolute conformity to its requirements, the Old Testament led man to feel his weakness and misery, and his need of divine assistance. Thus, by inducing him to look away from self to God, it in a measure crushed and destroyed his selfishness, and at the same time, made known to him the vanity of all things pertaining merely to this world. Secondly, by prophecy it awakened and kept alive in him hope and confidence in God, and in this way positively prepared him to enter into union with the divine nature. The New Testament, on the other hand, fulfils and completes the Old, by making that which was outward in it a part of man's inward being. In the later covenant, God, who in the earlier revealed Himself to man, reveals Himself in man, and the outward command is done away by becoming part of man's inmost life. It is, therefore, not destroyed, but in the true sense fulfilled.

In both Revelations accordingly we see a wondrous adaptation of means to an end. It was not by a mere arbitrary arrangement on the part of God, that the preparatory revelation was *outward* and *shadowy*, while that which succeeds it is *inward* and *substantial*. It was necessary that God should first, by an outward revelation, woo man to Himself, before He would reveal Himself in man. To have at once revealed Himself inwardly would have been to destroy the freedom of man, and so man himself. As it was by an outward influence brought to bear on him by the Evil one, that he sundered himself from God, so was he by outward influences again to be won back to God; and as this sundering was effected by creating mistrust of God in his mind, and engendering selfishness, so must that which would lead him back, destroy selfishness and awaken trust; which is just what the Old Testament Revelation did. So too was it necessary that the New Testament Revelation should be an inward and substantial one in order that man might possess permanent and abiding power to continue in holiness, and thus secure for himself eternal life.

ART. IV.—THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF HISTORY.

BY PROF. E. E. HIGBEE, D.D.

In nature below man we do not reach the province of history proper. There is here, it is true, a process in which the idea of each thing is becoming realized, and where the various orders, reaching up towards man, are found to be mutually related and dependent, one advancing above the other towards consummation in something higher. In the vegetable order, for example, the plant when viewed simply as brought into existence by the creative act of God, cannot be regarded as the accomplished realization of its idea, as this is contained in the divine mind. On the contrary rather, the idea itself reaches out from its infinite rest into space and time, where its full realization involves a process. In the plant there is growth, a wide compass of possibilities to be actualized. The plant is itself in movement, maturing and reproducing itself. It rises above the crude material base where it stands, — the seemingly motionless soil,—and, in its movement and change, its growth and reproduction, its glorification of the lower by carrying it up into leaf and blossom, into fragrance and moving grace, — shows itself a new and higher creation, a divine idea not until now through it dawning into light. The process here, however, is not intelligible to itself. While it evinces at every point that its origin and continuance have their ground in a life of intelligence and will, yet the law in which this life shows its presence and activity comes, in the vegetable world, to no inward manifestation in consciousness. The plant moves in a fixed and ever-recurring cycle, full of purpose, no doubt, but to itself dark, with no self-determination or judgment, with no self-advance in the way of free activity, and therefore with no *history*

It has been stated already that in the process of creation there is an advance, as from the crude material to vegetable growth, and from vegetable growth again to animal instinct; yet this advance is not of such character as to imply that any one order passes beyond its own type of being by developing into another. The comprehensive world-idea breaks itself by limitations into subordinate, gradational ideas, through which it utters itself. There is in the lower a semblance of the higher, a mute prophecy of its approach, but no power in itself to transcend its own limits in such direction. This semblance and prophecy only show that the divine Reason, in which the lower process rests, contains also the higher, and this higher as already present in the creative mind declares itself more or less distinctly through the lower as about to appear. The animal is by no means an advanced vegetable, but a new and higher creation, which the vegetable only foreshadows and opens the way for. In its life there is far less fixedness, and far more distinct anticipations of the human. Yet in animal instinct there is no freedom, no self-determining activity, no real advance from within — no *history*. The animal lives and perpetuates itself, moving in the same monotonous circle from one generation to another.

In man we reach an entirely new and higher order of life. We come into the moral sphere. The law, still having its ground as before in the Divine, no longer acts, however, as an outward and blind power, but comes to an inward manifestation. It is authenticated as law in the reason and will, and the process before man is one of free activity, one in which he is himself to be a conscious agent in his own movement and destiny, and at the same time judge of his own activities. There is no monotonous circle here, ever-recurring, the same from generation to generation, but development, one generation taking up the life of that going before, not to repeat it, but to carry it onward towards its completion. There is a vast and ever-progressive movement, in which the idea of the world's life is pressing forward in the form of reason and will toward its full realization, — a process more grand than

that of the circling seasons, more sublime than the sweep of myriad stars — *history.*

The moral element, which thus characterizes man and makes history possible, is just that which, at the same time, makes it necessary for him to settle in his own mind the meaning and aim of the world in whose life he is so central and controlling. Only in this way can he properly grasp the destiny of his own being, and in wisdom pursue the proper course to reach it. His nature, just because it is in the sphere of intelligence and will, demands that he form some conception of history, that he bring its various phenomena under some general law, that he realize in his own consciousness the aim of its process, and not drift on the current, either with sluggish indifference or with trembling forebodings of strange disaster and wreck. The plant may bud, and grow, and blossom, and pass away, all unconscious of its own cycle of life; but man cannot; and to that very extent to which he allows it, he has perverted and degraded the very characteristic of his being, sinking back into mere unconscious nature. A philosophy of history is therefore not a matter of mere speculation, but a most earnest moral necessity. We have no right as men, as moral beings, to shut our eyes and be led, like nature below us, we know not where or how, whether by human or divine authority. We have no right to set aside what is fundamental in our nature and order of life, and blindly throw ourselves into the arms of either Providence or Fate.

As important as, in this light, is the question, what is the idea of History? involving as it does the whole order of the world's life in every form of its manifestation yet no adequate answer, we maintain, can be given except from the Christian stand-point. From an interest of science simply, the mind may be stimulated to reduce all its material to unity, and thus strive to find, in the midst of the various movements of ages, a world-teleology which shall serve such end; but the effort, if involving no more than a generalization of the intellect, will prove a failure. The central mystery of the Incarnation, itself a fact all comprehensive and full of illumination, appre-

hended by the higher intuition of faith, and, as thus apprehended, a fountain of life and light to the world, cannot be set aside as an unwarrantable assumption until demonstrated by some logical process. Its demonstration is within itself. Flesh and blood do not reveal it, and without it they cannot come to know either their own meaning, or that of the world. By faith we know the worlds were made (Heb. xi. 3), and in a deeper sense also for what end they were made (Col. i. 16).

At first view it may seem contrary to all right method of thought not to analyze carefully and without any previous assumption the process of history itself, using the various facts which it supplies as material to ascertain by induction the law regulating it. History allows no *a priori* construction of itself, it is claimed. In any analysis of its facts, however, we must be dependent upon our own apprehension of them, and upon the regulative laws of our own reason. This apprehension is itself of necessity conditioned as a moral act. Our nature does not reflect facts as an unconscious mirror. The facts themselves also do not stand before our gaze as objects of nature, but come to us in forms of reason and will. If then we are in any way linked to the supernatural, and have any power of beholding it in its own light, why, under such intuition, may we not find that which shall so illumine our whole analysis, as to prove itself, the more earnestly we examine the facts, the very central sun of the whole system? The very effort of reason to find a unity, and the consequent analysis and generalization, alike presuppose the reality of the unity sought for, and failing, as we maintain, to reach it, only find rest in the revelation of such unity and centre to faith.

Still further, in contemplating the complicated facts of history to analyze them, it is vain to suppose that the analysis is to proceed in the way of a mere repetition of the facts impressed upon the mind as a mass of disconnected particulars, the mind remaining a mere table of wax to catch the impress of them merely. The effort to analyze rests upon the assumption that it is made with a higher interest than that of mere repetition. Thought, which characterizes man, must of necessity be an

element in such a work. But thought itself requires that the process of history be viewed as a rational one, and not the mere chance play of blind forces,—that it have aim and purpose in the belief of which alone a philosophy of it can be conceived in thought to be at all possible. The philosopher, as such merely, approaches history bringing with him what he assumes as proved in speculation, and then uses this as a theory, viewed however as an established truth in the sphere of thought, but an hypothesis yet in the sphere of history, which however is to show itself a reality in the result of his analysis. So Hegel brings to his contemplation of history what he assumes as already speculatively proved, viz.: that Reason (defined as its own infinite material and energy—the substance of the universe, thought conditioning itself with perfect freedom) rules the world, and the hypothesis, which the result of his analysis of the facts of history is to make real, is, that "*the history of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of freedom.*" Now the Christian, not in opposition to philosophy, however, but as conditioning all the while its analysis and generalization, brings to his contemplation of the world a conception of history which shuts out all speculative hypothesis as to its aim or end. By his faith in the Person of Christ, which, in the interest of philosophy, he neither has right, nor is called upon, to set aside, he has found what is absolute truth in the sphere both of thought and of being. Christ is to him the Alpha and Omega of the world's movement,—the illuminating centre in which all processes are to reveal their meaning. Thus standing in Christ, he surveys the world; and past and present and future are measured in the life and light of faith.

In the consciousness of Christian faith then, what must be regarded to be the ultimate design of the world, and wherein lies the possibility of its realization? In answering these questions, what we have called the Christian conception of history will manifest itself.

Christian faith excludes at once the thought that the creation is either self-produced or self-subsistent. It holds firm the conviction, that the universe of the finite has its origin from

God, that it is the result of his own free, determining, creative act. "*In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,*" is the unalterable preface to its cosmogony. Here the eternity of the world is properly guarded against, and at the same time that pantheism which identifies the created and the creating, or sees in the creative process God finding a form, or God finding his self-consciousness in man. The doctrine, however, that the world comes from nothing is not properly an element of Christian faith. While the world has its origin from God by a free creative act, and not by any necessity growing out of his own otherwise incompleteness, Christianity equally emphasizes the truth that it has its origin also in God. The dictum "*ex nihilo nihil fit,*" has for faith as well as for reason a large measure of truth. That the idea of the world, as a freely determined thought of God, is existent in the divine Reason,—in the eternal Logos, is distinctively a Christian conception. The universe is never viewed by faith as a sheer projection from God, and so separate from him by creative act as to have its life and continuance thereafter in itself. "In him was life, and the life was the light of men," (St. John i. 4). "In him we live and move and have our being," (Acts xvii. 28). In Colossians also, Christ is called "the First-born of *every creature,*" (*πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*) and "in him and by him and for him all things were created," (*ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τα παντα . . . τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται*) (Colossians i. 16—18). Thus all things are viewed as having their archetypal existence in the Logos, and by him they come out into created finiteness in space and time, and as such exist for him, and hold together only in his self-subsistent life, which is ever the underlying principle of their order and continuance, ("*καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν,*" Colossians i).

In this Christian view of creation, quite unknown to every other order of religious thought, there is involved also, in a general form, a world-teleology. The world is destined for the Logos. In its normal order it moves towards him, as its real centre of rest, and is to find in him its full realization. In him we and all things find completeness. In him, not viewed

as an unconditionable eternal—a move less absolute, essentially apart from the world and even beyond conception,—but in him, as incarnate,—as a self-revelation of God in man, as Christ the second Adam, and life-giving head of the race. Before the Incarnation, the destiny of the creation is viewed as hidden, there being no full utterance of the divine purpose; but in the Incarnation we have such utterance challenging both faith and adoration—a full revelation of the dispensation or economy of all processes as they are to come to their completion by being gathered together in one in Christ. (Ephesians i. 9, 10). A view of this kind has ever shown itself common to the thought of the Christian Church. Justin Martyr regards the physical world as including in itself a reference to the Incarnation, and this because pervaded by the Logos. He sees in Heathenism a measure of relative truth, because the very nature of man has not only the idea of God, but is essentially related to the Logos, in whose self-manifestation in the flesh, the absolute for the rational and religious life of mankind has been reached. In Irenæus the same thought comes to a fuller utterance. He sees in Christ the great archetype in living relation to which man came into being, and in partaking of which, therefore, he can alone realize his own idea. Christ, to his faith, involves in his own person the whole organism of humanity, and recapitulating, carries its whole process freely onward in history to its completion. He constitutes thus the very source and substance and unity of every movement in which the primal idea comes to its full realization. Tertullian carries the same thought to what may be regarded a dangerous extreme, in full accordance, however, with his impulsive nature. In his view, the Logos is eternally related to man and the creation, as the very sphere in which he gives completeness to that eternal thought of God, according to which, the world was made to reach its proper fullness in the God-man. The Logos, therefore, in his view not only creates, but immanently controls the whole process of the world's life towards his own incarnation, which completes the involved idea of both the creation and himself. Space forbids a more ex-

tended reference. Nor is this necessary, for the object is not to lay stress upon the form of expression so much as upon the ruling thought itself which is common to the Church. This thought is, that the world is ever mediated to the Divine by the Logos, and that its processes are so controlled by him, that the mystery of his Incarnation is that central light in which their own meaning and movement may be properly understood. It is in the light of this great mystery of a pre-existent Logos opening the way most freely for his Incarnation, which so filled the glowing thought of the Apostle Paul, and glittered before the eagle-eyed intuition of St. John, that the order of creation, as given by Moses, is found to be so significant, in its advance from stage to stage, as to stand out a mysterious, foreshadowing prophecy of the *Divine-human*, towards which it is made to look and direct itself. It can hardly be regarded out of place here to examine this more in detail, not only as a general preface to history, but also as rendering more intelligible the divine idea under which the world was created, and reaches out to its full realization, for this idea as absolute, utters itself in different degrees, or through relative ideas, towards such full manifestation.

The material world is a mystery whose meaning and end can never be understood only as we come to know its relations to the higher world of moral and spiritual being beyond it. We may study its structure, acquaint ourselves with the workings of its laws, and bring them into the sphere of our conscious understanding in such way as to construct physical sciences. But who can conceive that this is the end of the whole material world, which apart from this subjective form in the sphere of thought, has a real objective existence? Matter, (there seems to be no less ambiguous term), unconsciously, yet really, as an element of the world's life, reaches out in its whole process towards Christ, as the centre where its own end is at last realized, (Romans viii. 21, 22). First, in its various masses, it is in fixed connection with an invisible power and law which determine all the while its character and form. The grain of sand, for example, is not an inert mass merely, in

this or that form and position by accident. There is with it and in it an invisible power holding its parts together in their fixed and definite relations. This is true not only of the crystallized sand, but also of the whole material world. The outward and inward, the visible and invisible, the form and the informing plasticity in fixed union in the material world constitute its reality. It is impossible to conceive of a drifting, formless, lawless material proceeding from the creative word of God.

There is in matter, however, a capacity for something higher, where losing this, its fixed character, it is made to enter into relations with a more advanced power, that of vegetable life. Here the union is no less intimate, but of a quite different character. In the former grade we have what may be called fixed formation. Here we have growth—a process of development, in which the general law of vegetable life as the idea, comes into concrete actuality by constructing out of the already constituted matter limitations for itself, species, and individual forms in which its own presence and power are made manifest. In this way matter is taken up from its original base, and is so organically related to the power of life as to answer upon every hand its higher end. So far as the plant is above the crude soil beneath it, so far also has matter in it been exalted. For this exaltation it had original capacity, but could not of itself reach out so far. It prophesies in that direction, but cannot fulfil. "The metal at its height of being seems a mute prophecy of the coming vegetable, into a mimic semblance of which it crystallizes." (Coleridge).

Matter has not yet, however, reached its end. Above the vegetable world rises the animal. As the central life-power in the plant evolves its definite form, by organically taking up matter and assimilating it, transforming it from its fixed elementary character into living tissues,—leaves, flower, and fruit inclosing its own germinant principle of reproduction; so now the higher reality of life and instinct, and instinctive intelligence in animal being, lays hold of these organized structures of the vegetable world, and by still more wonderful energy car-

ries matter into still higher organic relations. Tissues, leaves, flower, and fruit now become blood and nerves, and flesh and bone, moved hither and thither by an instinctive volition dwelling in and controlling the whole animated organism. Matter becomes animate body. Having been taken up into the vegetable organism, it there makes manifest higher capacities, yet develops no power of satisfying them. Here again it prophesies, but cannot fulfil. "The blossom and flower, the acme of vegetable life, divides into correspondent organs with reciprocal functions, and by instinctive motions and approximations, seems impatient of that fixture by which it is differenced in kind from the flower-shaped Psyche, that flutters with free wing above it." (Coleridge).

In the animal, however, matter has not come to its height of progressive exaltation. Above the animal rises man, the sun which floods with light all that has gone before. The world now wakens to a consciousness of itself, and becomes possibly free. In man, under higher forms, we have the whole lower world recapitulated, and in this he shows himself on one side linked organically to the system of nature itself: but the lower world, as recapitulated in him, only comes in such exaltation to be the base of an altogether new and more noble movement, in which the order of creation on its material side reaches still nearer its completion. It is well to remark here, notwithstanding the digression; how physical nature, by such organic relationship with man's moral being, comes to be quite an important conditioning factor of history. Heeren perhaps makes too much account of this. He says, in the preface of his History of Greece: "the Mediterranean Sea belongs to the south of Europe; and it was by means of that sea, that the nations of the west were formed. Let an extensive heath occupy its place, and we should be wandering Tartars and Mongolians, like the Nomades of middle Asia." Though this may be an exaggeration, yet no one can question the influence which scenery and climate and the whole order of physical nature, have upon human life. What we are made to feel and hear and see, from the heavens above, or from the earth beneath, is ever entering

into our mould. The body is not only affected, but through it the whole inward nature. Climate seems to determine sometimes the whole practical life of a people. The Esquimaux are forced as it were to their peculiar mode of existence; so also is it with other zones beside the frigid, though in a less marked degree. Language is most seriously affected in this way, and thus indirectly the whole literature and imagination of a people come under its influence. The rough hardy speech of the north tells plainly of chilling blasts, of drifting snows, and of frozen lakes; while the smooth and gentle tones of the warmer south, are redolent of the breath of Spring, and plainly mirror sunny slopes, and flowing streams with tangled vine and clustering narcissus.

> "We are what suns, and winds, and water makes us;
> The mountains are our sponsors, and the rills
> Fashion and win their nursling with their smiles.—LANDOR.

The scenes of nature are our companions, growing more intimate day by day; and those most familiar, wherever we may be, are ever entering the study of our imagination, and often giving direction even to our acts. The shepherd is "half a shepherd on the stormy sea, and hears in piping shrouds, the tones of water-falls, and inland sounds of caves and trees, and in the bosom of the deep, sees mountains, sees the forms of sheep that graz'd on verdant hills." (Wordsworth). We are of the earth. Though the ties between physical nature and body and soul and spirit are invisible, they are nevertheless real.

But to return. We have in man the union of psychic body with spirit. Matter has thus been taken up from its most elementary forms, and through mysterious mediations has entered into organic union with conscious spirit, where although in continual change, coming and going, and still the same, it never loses its identity as the characterized form of an inward life-principle and law. What glorification matter has now reached! We speak not of symmetry of proportion, delicacy of sensation, and flexibility of movement, which are in themselves truly wonderful; but, inasmuch as sensation has been taken up in

perception and carried on into the process of conscious thought and determining will, and the whole mystery of a moral world. has been reached, a Tabor of transfiguration, we speak of a certain translucence through the flesh of this invisible, illuminating, inner world. Emotions play upon the countenance and thought lights up the whole expression. Surface is becoming spiritualized. The eye seems filled with the soul, and the whole body gives momentary glimpses of the mysterious spiritual intercourse within. This of itself seems enough to convince one, that the Gnostic annihilation of matter, in order to get the unbound spiritual, is not in harmony with the divine law of life.

By no means, however, has the order which we have thus far traced come to its close. Psychic body is not the end. The glorified, resurgent, spiritual body is the precious goal towards which the whole process has been looking. "There is a natural (*ψυχικόν*) body, and there is a spiritual (*πνευματικόν*) body. And so it is written: The first Adam was made a living soul (*ψυχὴν ζῶσαν*), the last Adam a quickening spirit (*πνευμα ζωοποιοῦν*). Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural," (1 Corinthians xv. 45–47).

The material world, as it is organically related to the moral and spiritual, finds thus its proper consummation in the resurrection and glorification of Christ. Especially in view of the disorganization of sin, which manifests its presence throughout the whole realm of nature, the whole physical creation, in and through man, groans and travails in pain waiting for redemption and deliverance, (Romans viii. 20–24). Matter, having reached in man such intimate union with spirit, does not thereafter, like Acestes' arrow, consume itself in moving onward, nor does it become lost in the infinite spirit. Its possibility of immortality and deliverance from corruption is reached in Christ. He is the centre in which the aim and end of the physical come to their revelation. The new heavens and the new earth, evolved by His quickening Spirit from the old as disorganized by sin, find in Him, the glorified human, the source of their completeness and their eternal headship. Nature and spirit

are not in irreconcilable antithesis, nor in such relation that the one must in the end absorb the other. Von Baader has said, with equal truth and beauty, "Die * * * geistlose Auffassung der Natur musste die naturlose Auffassung des Geistes und die gottlose Auffassung beider zur Folge haben."

What we have now said of the physical, is also true of the moral world. Indeed, because it is true of the latter, is it true of the former. In the moral world, however, reaching the sphere of consciousness and self-determination, we reach also the possibility of transgression, the possibility of willing an end contrary to that which the idea of our being, as in the mind of God, involves. The presence of sin, as inwardly conditioning the whole development of human life, the Christian conception of history most unequivocally recognizes, for the Incarnation reveals itself to faith, in one and that a very important aspect, as *redemptive and atoning.* It is impossible, therefore, from the Christian stand-point, to view the process of history as an uninterrupted normal development, without obstructions and disorganizations. Not only is the *presence* of sin recognized by Christian faith, but the *nature* of it also is to be properly determined in its light; and it is just this which is of immense importance in determining our conception of history.

Christian consciousness will not allow the thought, that, in the mind of God, the idea of the world involved the *necessity* of sin. God is not viewed as an indifferent absolute, with no moral determinateness, but as a personal being, incapable of such a self-contradiction as to give being by creative act to that which of necessity must be contrary to his own will. That will, as law and life, inwardly to regulate the created, and even to form the essential ground of its being and continuance, cannot, without giving up the Christian conception of God, be viewed as active in producing that which must refuse it, and refusing, seek and make another centre in itself, and at the same time be viewed as active in condemning the same for only realizing what had already been purposed and determined by that will. God cannot be thus against himself; and our

sense of guilt excludes all thought that we are in any sense creatively involved in sin. Our moral nature, in condemning its own act, would in this case condemn God also. Sin in no sense is thus essential to the being or development of the creature. If present, it must be foreign to the original nature of man, and to the whole idea of the world. It may be thought by some that the creation of a human will, in which there is the possibility of transgression, is at the same time a determination of the will towards such transgression. But the will, by the very terms of the statement, is created a self-determining power, and hence its determination by creative act would be a contradiction of its own idea. The whole Christian conception of guilt, of alienation from God and true self, of repentance, of penalty and judgment, compel us to find the starting point of sin in the self-determination of the finite will against God, and to maintain that God's creative act in the moral sphere involved a process in which, without His determining volition, sin could manifest its presence. It is true, the process itself is only possible by the preserving presence of the Divine The will in man has not, any more than the physical, a self-subsistent life. But this preservation of the will when contrary to the Divine in no sense fixes its determination, but rather opens the way for a better issue. Man, not beginning in a necessary severance from God, but with the possibility of becoming by his own decision consciously and freely in harmony with him, with the possibility, in other words, of willing God's will, his failure to do so is his own act, and the false determination of his will ever grounds itself in its own false activity, while the power to act is ever from God. This is the testimony of our own consciousness in the sense of guilt. St. Augustine well says, "Nunc vero usque adeo peccatum voluntarium malum est, ut nullo modo sit peccatum, si non sit voluntarium; et hoc quidem ita manifestum est, ut nulla hinc doctorum paucitas, nulla indoctorum turba dissentiat. Quare aut negandum est peccatum committi, aut fatendum est, voluntate committi. Non autem recte negat peccasse animam, qui et penitendo eam corrigi fatetur, et veniam pœnitenti dari, et perseverantem in pec-

catis justa lege Dei damnari. Postremo, si non voluntate male facimus, nemo objurgandus est omnino, aut monendus de." (De vera relig. cap. 14). In one sense we may say that God does not allow sin, does not permit it, only as he refuses to annihilate the will or reduce it to irresponsible nature. He has created in infinite love that in whose height of being the possibility of transgression is involved, but this only as a perversion of that moral nature, the destruction of which would leave the creation a dark, silent blank, not knowing itself or God.

Still further, the Christian view regards sin as universal, reaching the whole of man's individual being, and covering also the whole organism of humanity. By Adam's transgression it first became central in human nature, not, however, as substance like poison, nor as a germ capable in and of itself of expansion and development. In him it was such moral conditioning of himself, though under Satanic seduction, against God, such self-perversion of his will, turning from God, its true centre and rest, to itself and to the world, as to bring his life at variance with its own divine law, subjecting himself thereby to spiritual death as both the penalty and consequence of his fall, and at the same time so disorganizing the normal disposition and relations of his nature as to cause physical death and also to open the way for evil to keep its lodgment in the midst of all the cosmical laws of the earth.

In this statement, which we regard but a paraphrase of the Scriptural record, the idea is by no means involved, that sin is a new germinal substance, developing from its own essence and reaching out by steady process to its culmination. It has no such integral power. It is at every point self-destructive, and for its very movement must be connected with substantial being, and thus only come to have what in this view may be called a law of development.* It is will, in its power of self-determina-

---

* "O that I could a sin once see!
We paint the devil foul, yet he,
Hath some good in him, all agree.
Sinne is flat opposite to th' Almighty, seeing
It wants the good of *vertue*, and of being." HERBERT.

tion, turning from God, the only absolute fountain of life, and seeking restlessly for independence; but in gaining this independence, were it conceived possible, it would that moment cease to be. Its development, therefore, is not substantially its own. On the contrary, it is all the while in process, only as it is a self-perversion and disorganization of that which, quite apart from it, has its original being and law. The possible eternity of it is found only in our own eternal and necessary dependence upon God, and not in its everlasting independence and self-development.

There is yet an important question to answer, viz., how does it diffuse itself? How does it continue in force onward in the development of the race from Adam? We have already opposed the thought, that in the generation of man it can be generated as a substance with him: but we should stand in direct opposition to the settled conviction of the Christian Church, if we maintained that its presence is conditioned after the fall of Adam, by the act or acts of each one's individual will in consciousness. Nothing can be more plainly taught in Scripture than the fact of an universal disorganization of mankind and the world. The necessity of a *new* birth in grace, so solemnly enforced by Christ, at once presupposes this. The Apostolic commission, sending the Sacrament-bearing Apostles to *all* nations only gives practical earnestness to the same sad truth, and the solemn admonition to look forward to a new heavens and earth, made possible only by the sacrifice and resurrection power of Christ, assumes its world-wide universalness. This universality is regarded as absolute, not depending upon individual self-conscious actions, but continually conditioning them. Is not sin then an essential element of our nature, part of the substance of being generated with us, and thus abidingly present? To answer this we must briefly refer to what is involved in man's generation.

In the plant, a definite plastic power in the process of growth moves the whole organism towards fructification, and in every new germ it is still latently lodged as the presence of a life-power there to carry it onward through a kindred process to a kindred

result, in connection, of course, with the necessary surrounding conditions. In animal propagation also, the higher unity of plasticity and instinct is carried over as a reproducing life into the embryo centre of the new. The animal structure, as body, is not first formed, and then a pre-existent or co-existent instinctive life-power lodged within it; but the life-power with all its distinctive characteristics is organizing the structure itself at all points and at all times from embryonic germ to developed maturity. We may call this life-power here the organic law of animalization, whose reality as general authenticates itself continually in the individual. It is a reality and not a mere abstraction or formula of the logical understanding. It is not a generalization simply, made by us from an examination of certain uniform resemblances and points of agreement between individuals, which may fall under our observation. It is that rather in which these resemblances and points of agreement have their real ground, and hence uniformly appear. It makes possible, as a general law immanent in the individuals, the generalization itself. The same is true also as regards man in his higher sphere. In generation here, it is not the body simply as a formed mass, which is reproduced with a pre-existent soul ready at hand to enter it and dwell there with an inbreathed spirit to link them as thus united to the higher spiritual world. The whole trichotomy of man's being, as constituting the organic life-process of his nature, is carried over truly into the embryonic beginning of the new, so that in generation the Adamic is made to move on organically from age to age. This position sets itself in opposition to that *pre-existence-theory*, which is common to the Gentile philosophy as well as to the anthropology of the Alexandrian school in the early Church, in which it is held that the *sarkic* only of man's being is really generated, while the *psychic* and *pneumatic* have long continued before in the Angelic sphere. The position is equally opposed to the theory of *creationism* in the usual form in which this theory is presented. That the body is only organically related to Adam through generation, and that the soul is created anew at every successive birth directly by God,

and outside of the organic life-process of the race, involves a dualism which is not satisfactorily removed by the statement, that the creation of the soul is simultaneous with the procreation of the body. The creation of the one, although simultaneous with the procreation of the other, is by no means their union in one common life-centre. Temporal conjunction is something quite different from organic union. This union of body and soul together with the spirit, which is after all the deeper ground of life in the whole nature, this union in one germinant centre, one *punctum saliens*, is conception which opens the way for birth. What God gives and man does are organically united in the conception itself. Now the perverting, disorganizing presence of sin reaches this characterizing law, which higher than plasticity or instinct, carries over its presence and power into the embryonic life-point of the new. It is this law which holds the constituting elements of man's being organically together in their starting point and in their development. It is just here that evil, on one side,* so attaches itself to the law of our human life in its genesis and unfolding as to be really inwoven in our conception and birth. Here as inwardly present, and covering all the possibilities of the nature itself, it becomes organic, or rather it has place and activity in that law of life which is so. Primarily this became possible by the self-perversion of the spiritual nature of the first Adam, who as generic head of the race, and lord of the creation, by his fall opened an unimpeded way for the perversion to cover the organic law of generation, and also to affect all those conditioning cosmical operations in the midst of which this law comes to utter itself. The Scriptures imply a truth of this kind, especially in the negative statement, made by St.

---

* There is another side, in which the evil, as universal and hereditary, manifests itself, notwithstanding, as *guilt*. It seems difficult to conceive of guilt without regarding it personal, and in no sense organic, depending upon a real self-determination of the person and this "*independent of the life of the genus.*" The fact of guilt as connected with original sin must in some form be maintained. In what way, however, guilt inheres in the fallen life, it may be difficult to determine, but this should not lead us to deny the fact itself. See Muller's Examination of the Objections made by Rothe and Dorner to his own attempted solution of the difficulty (Christian Doctrine of Sin, vol. 2.)

John, of the method of natural generation, "which were born not of *blood*, nor of the *will of the flesh*, nor of the *will of man*." (St. John i. 13).

Now man, under this universal condition of sin, originated in himself, and through his fall covering the whole world, commences and continues that development which constitutes history. Originally created to find his completeness and that of the world over which he was head, in willing God's will, in opening his nature freely to the highest self-communication and indwelling of God, in having his capacity God-ward fully met and filled by the great mystery of the God-man, the ideal, absolute centre of the whole order of creation, man's development, according to its idea, should move toward God. Such is its normal direction. The actual development, however, by the perversion of the life underlying it, must manifest itself abnormal. Not that sin, as some new self-created substance of life, developing makes history, (this we have endeavored to guard against); but that the originally divine-created human life, not destroyed in its self-diremption from its true centre, constitutes in its development a process in which it shows itself in ceaseless struggle with itself, and with the world, and with God.

Without at present bringing into view the supernatural, we may say, that there are two great powers in human life in jarring discord, or rather, that there is one process disintegrated and made to be in antagonism with itself. This may be seen in the great fact, (never to be lost sight of in forming our conception of history), that in the very midst of its own perversion, man's original being, as poised toward God and not entirely destroyed, asserts its presence in a hopeless reaching out for deliverance. The capacity for, and the need of, redemption are both realities. In the physical of man's nature, on the one side we have the terrible disintegration ever uttering itself in the universal, solemn dirge, "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust." On the other side, we have the constant and instinctive resistance of all this, in the concentration of vital forces to throw off the disorganization, in the contest

of body against corpse, which fails, if unassisted by the supernatural, to gain the victory. Disease has not in and of itself a development; and in sickness we ever see a struggle of life to emancipate itself from the evil as foreign to the law of the physical being, and yet inwardly lodged there. The body itself, not made to be a corpse, travails and groans for deliverance from its bondage. Indeed the whole creation abhors its own dissolution. It has, as it were, a mysterious sense that this is not its true destiny, not so much a dream of Eden lost, as a dim, shadowy vision of the Resurrection. The divine idea of its being, seems to utter itself over against the invading disorganization. Could we predicate consciousness of the physical, as we can of that which brought it into being, its whole process would sum itself up in a despairing cry for deliverance, in one universal groan uttering its need, and repeating its vain effort to cast off the terrible burden. To this despairing cry, heard by Him who has ears to hear, there is and can be but one answer, which will at all solve the mystery, viz. "*I am the resurrection and the life.*" The resurgent, glorified body of Jesus is the guaranty and source of the deliverance and proper perfection of the physical world-process. "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, *according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.*" (Phil. iii. 21).

In the moral sphere, we see a kindred process of antagonism. God is resisted; self is made the centre; enmity is developed between man and man, and between nation and nation; debasing passions reign; world-wide wickedness covers every sphere of life, and reaches ever downward toward a dissolution more awful than the crumble of the grave. Yet even here, beneath and amidst this wreck, is discovered the presence of the undestroyed original. The true idea of our moral nature struggles to assert itself in its own disorganization. God-consciousness, reason, conscience, religious and social instincts, family affections, sympathy of man for man spontaneously rising up to evince the organic brotherhood of the race, organized states, mythic dreams of the ideal and aspirations

towards its actualization in art, religious systems, philosophy, &c &c., all are actively present, showing disorganization, it is true, but holding up to the light, at the same time, the great truth that this moral discord is felt to be foreign to man's true nature, and that it cannot be the essential of his being, but an awful bondage, though self-imposed; a burden of guilt and suffering under which like Prometheus, fettered and helpless, it can only wait for deliverance. The conflict, for conflict it is of self with self, as well as of self with God, would be no conflict, had sin become the substance of our being. Guilt, which in the moral sphere ever connects itself with sin, is at once the evidence that *we ourselves* feel that we are not what we ought to be, that there is an ideal moral harmony which the actual of our life, by its own determination, is contrary to, but which still inwardly, as the very law of our life, makes known its violation in awakened conscience, in loss of self-respect, in painful regrets, and in harrowing remorse. This strange antagonism and conflict must be endless, if there be no supernatural aid, and the very idea of our moral nature end in failure, its whole process prove itself but a voice growing weaker and weaker in the wilderness, with no answer from above, and the felt contradiction between duty and will, between destiny and actual condition, continue in man's consciousness an eternal discord. Such would be history without the supernatural,—a vast movement, sublime even in disorganization, but at every crisis ending in failure and despair, and sinking deeper into the opening abyss of misery and death—humanity, in the image of God, yet groping amidst its own wide-scattered ruins, its consciousness of the Divine uttering itself in an ever unanswered cry, "*O that thou wouldst rend the heavens, that thou wouldst come down.*"

This is of itself a strong presumption that the supernatural will in some form enter into history to counteract such disorganization. Who can settle down to the awful conviction that the moral world shall end in wreck? Who can acknowledge, seeing in dimmed vision the hidden grandeur of the true and beautiful and good, hovering before him, and yet unreached,

who can acknowledge, without a fearful surrender of every impulse of his moral nature, that the true idea of humanity shall prove an everlasting failure, a nisus only and never completed? While conscience sends strange trembling fears all through our spirit, are there not at the same time strange, mystic, prophetic voices of aspirations and hopes, which, never satisfied and never quiet, wait in travail and in pain for some redemption? Shall all these drop away, go out in darkness? Shall sin be conqueror forever, and everlastingly contrapose Jehovah's work with mocking satire? Shall there be no power to remit and absolve? Is history to be a helpless burden of vanity from its opening to its close? Is the moral nature, higher than the heavens above and deeper than the depths beneath, and more sublime than the whole universe beside, to be bound helpless forever? Will no one come and break the fetters, and take Prometheus from the rock? The very questions, rising up unbidden within the human spirit, form, we may say, a presumption in favor of supernatural interposition.

But to return. Such *would* be history, we have said, without the supernatural: but such it is not. Faith recognizes at once the presence of the supernatural in the order of our life. We say purposely the *presence* of the supernatural; for by Christian consciousness the supernatural is not regarded as an outward theophany or mere wonderwork, apart from man, forcing either adoration or dread, and coming to no inward authentication in his moral nature. Such, to a great extent, is the idea of the supernatural in Heathenism, where in the end it resolves itself into the superhuman merely or contranatural—into mere magic, and thus is destitute of all proper ethical import. From the Christian stand-point, however, the supernatural as a direct manifestation of the Divine, in word or act, in promise or miracle, is viewed as addressing itself to the deepest centre of our moral being, which in its original constitution is intimately allied to it, and which has, though fallen, a capacity for it, a point of contact and a possibility of response. Here and not on the outside, it becomes *revelation* and *inspiration*. The outward manifestation, and the inward susceptibility are so far

brought into harmony with each other, that the unveiling of the Divine is at the same time the lifting up of the human to its apprehension. In so far as it is revelation it is inspiration, not setting aside the order of life in which it comes to pass, but actually so apprehending it as to bring it gradually to a fuller consciousness of its own deepest sense and meaning. In the person of Christ, where the Divine and human do not mutually exclude each other, but form the unity of one personal life wherein the human, apprehending the Divine with the same fullness with which it is itself apprehended by it, and thus perfecting its own idea, loses not but finds itself—in the person of Christ, the whole meaning of revelation and inspiration, in their absolute form is reached. It is, as preparatory to this and in its revealing light, therefore, that the presence of the supernatural in pre-Christian history must be viewed.

A twofold preparation seems necessary for the advent of the God-man. This advent reveals itself in Christian consciousness as the introduction of a new and higher life into the organism of history, more comprehensive than it, yet so organically related to it, as to be able at the same time to recapitulate it, and carry it on out of disorganization into its perfection. The introduction of this theanthropic life, however, is not magical. It does not set aside the moral nature of man, forcing entrance arbitrarily and abruptly. Involved, as we believe, in the divine idea of the creation from the start, it already underlies the whole antecedent process of the world as a mystery not yet come, but coming, and forms thus, through history and in it, its own way of access, its chamber and royal hall,—its birth womb in the world.

> "Procedit ethalamo *suo*
> Pudoris aula regia." (ST. AMBROSE.)

Hence a twofold preparatory process seems necessary. On the one hand, where the presence of this underlying mystery by direct divine revelation progressively utters itself, and thus becomes an element of trust and hope and moral discipline in man's development, awakening his highest aspirations towards,

and his deepest susceptibilities for, the Divine; and on the other hand, where, on the base of unassisted nature, the revelation being waved away, the development is so left to go on in the midst of struggle and disorganization, as to bring man to a full sense of his helpless need, in which he may realize that under sin all his God-ward aspirations and inward christological impulses, in and of themselves, end in failure. The positive side of this preparatory process constitutes *Judaism;* the negative, *Heathenism.*

History, as already stated, is not only a development of man's moral nature, but through it a continuous revelation of the purpose of God. Revelation, therefore, ever the same in idea, is itself historical. *It* moves onward, in the flow of history, from germ to maturity, opening the way continually for the completion of its own meaning. The thought, prevalent in many quarters, that in revelation a door is opened and a heavenly mystery bursts through upon the astonished world, and that then the door closes as the mystery is withdrawn again from the world, and darkness, for a while suspended, resumes its wonted sway, much as the glare of lightning darts from a cloud and buries itself in another, making for a moment only the darkness visible,—this thought is subversive of the very idea of revelation. It is from above, it is true, having its source immediately in the Divine. It is supernatural, yet as revelation it manifests its presence in history by becoming an element in its movement, and a controlling element also; for the true idea of the world is that which the divine will, through the medium of man's free intelligence, is to realize. The supernatural is a reality quite above the order of nature, but in revelation it comes into the order of nature. The very idea of revelation involves not only the coming down of the Divine to the human, but at the same time the bringing up of the human to the Divine. There can be no revelation where the supernatural stands entirely on the outside of the natural. The two must in some way come together. The full idea of revelation, in this view, is realized when the Divine and human, supernatural and natural actually become one in the consciousness of

life. The Person of Christ, therefore, is absolute revelation. In the mysterious compass of this Person, the Divine and human are included with all that properly characterizes them undisturbed. In Judaism, therefore, as preparatory to this, the revelation of the supernatural is progressive, having its own eras and epochs from the first promise, infinite in its contents, and unfolding through ages as promise and covenant and law and prophecy towards the full realization of its meaning in the Incarnation, whither all looked and tended. But the revelation of the supernatural had not its eras and epochs separate from the development of history. Just because it was not a mere abstraction, or contranatural myth or philosophical speculation, but a divine reality entering the moral sphere, and addressing itself to the deepest wants and susceptibilities and capacities of man's whole being, it had movement and ethical meaning. This is plainly seen in the fact that the antithesis between Judaism and Heathenism was not primarily the result of any arbitrary divine appointment. At first the revelation was of most general character, both in contents and application. It was addressed in undeveloped promise to Adam and Eve, and included, therefore, the whole race, and at the same time was of such character as to meet the very necessities of their condition. At the start, no individual or nation is formally set apart to whom it should especially pertain. In relation to it, however, two classes soon divergently developed themselves, as the genealogy of the Patriarchs from Adam to Noah plainly indicates. Abel, Enoch and Noah mark (see the eleventh chapter of Hebrews) those in whom the apprehending revelation is apprehended, and the way thus opened for its further unfolding. So all the while (we cannot enter into detail), the germinant first promise, progressively and in relation to history, articulates itself, advancing to covenant and law and prophecy where, in inspiration, the Divine and human are in one form already interpenetrating each other; and when, on the divine side, it consummated itself in the Incarnation of the Logos, on the world-side it had carried human susceptibility to its very highest preparatory potence in the woman whose seed was to bruise the

serpent's head. In that precious response to the heavenly salutation and annunciation, "*behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy word,*" for which Gabriel waited, and hearing, with joy departed, the moral result of the whole past inspired and inspiring revelation had reached its fullest concentration.

In Heathenism, destitute of all direct divine revelation, and therefore, turned back upon that revelation which confronts man in the sphere of the finite, of self and the worlds—we have a process of an entirely negative character. Not that Heathenism ever so sundered itself from the divine idea of the world's process as to have no historical meaning in opening the way for the Incarnation. It was the unaided self-development of the human to its utmost under the disorganization of sin,* bringing the need of redemption to its deepest intensity, and forcing in its very attempt and failure, the great and necessary truth home to the consciousness, that the capacity of human nature cannot be met and satisfied in this way. The God-consciousness, a characteristic element of man's nature, and not destroyed by sin, had in the case of Heathenism, no proper objective supernatural world to meet it, and enkindle and control its development and activity. Therefore, it sought its object in that which in the finite sphere met that sense of absolute dependence which its own presence ever awakens in the moral nature. Heathenism was nature-religion, and is, therefore, susceptible of two broad divisions, according as the God-consciousness, perverted and without its true object, seeks it, on the one hand, in the objective creation, or, on the other, in the subjective—the human.

---

* As intimately interwoven with this disorganization, we have in Heathenism the supernatural in the form of demons or evil spirits. This is recognized by the Scriptures throughout; and the polytheistic worship of Heathenism, on this its dark side, may be rightly regarded a demon-worship. So the Apostle Paul speaks of it in first Corinthians. "But I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils and not to God, &c." (x. 20, 21); and also again in Ephesians ii. 2. Another feature is also constantly manifest in Heathen polytheism, viz.: a restless dissatisfaction with its assumed supernatural, and an effort to secure something more real, a movement thus in search of the true God. This feature the Apostle Paul also recognizes in his opening address to the Athenians. (Acts xvii. 22).

The former peculiarly characterizes oriental Heathenism, and indeed moulds the whole order of oriental life. The idea of personality seems to have no lodgment in this religion. Mere nature, with its beneficent and hurtful powers, seems to exhaust the supernatural. The infinite of mere power, and this *physical*, and not of will or thought, overshadowing all individuality and personal relations, characterizes in a general way the whole civil and religious consciousness of the Orient. The consciousness of God, not met by God himself, seeks him as an all-absorbing objective, in which the human at last is overwhelmed and lost. God is *the all*, ever opposed to concrete distinctions, or *the nothing*, as remorselessly excluding all idea of individuality. The Heathenism of the West seeks its supernatural in the subjective world. It strives to evolve the Divine out of self, and in a perverted way find God in an apotheosis. Nature is spiritualized, and the personal characterizes the whole sphere of the Divine. Pan, the god of nature, is after all more an apotheosis of the inward impression which the vastness of nature makes, than that vastness itself. The human is continually projected into the objective world. Spirit is realized rather than the mere outward. Nymphs and Naiads, &c., are not personifications of outward nature, but nature etherealized within the human soul. The inner ideal world is to become God. This side of Heathenism reached its highest concentration of effort in the art and philosophy and government of the Greek and Roman world; yet in all these colossal forms, Pelion piled on Ossa heavenward, it still looked out toward a truth and beauty and reality, a unity of ideal and actual, which it could not reach. In the Oriental, God did never really become man. In the Occidental, man did never really become God. Both could supply no divine wisdom to turn to account the vast resources of the nations by either purifying them or directing them to their true end. In Greece and Rome, the whole vast and magnificent structure of Heathenism had no proper foundation or support, no conserving force, and only culminated in its grandeur to crumble away. Just this in Heathenism brought its need of redemption to its height, and compelled it

to find help from above, or despair. Its whole mythology, gods, and demigods, and hero worship, its art and philosophy, its infinite continually excluding the finite, its finite never really reaching the infinite, all is, in this view, a sort of dreamy, visionary sense of a glorious unreached unity, a finite-infinite and infinite-finite, an ideal-actual and actual-ideal, a *God-man*. It could not find it, and yet despairing could not but long for it. "*The light shone in darkness.*" The darkness, though not apprehending it, could not suppress its glimmering presence. Though thus religiously negative, there is yet in one sense a positive movement of history in Heathenism, a developing consciousness of freedom, deepening the sense of guilt and need, and making more clear the discord between destiny and actual condition, and a developing concentration of the results of human efforts, affording material to be assimilated by a higher life, and thus made to enter into the onward progress of the race under grace.

Thus, according to the Christian conception, all history, before Christ, is a development in which the physical and moral and supernatural look toward one great centre and unity, the God-man, where their true meaning is reached, and for which they were preparatory both in a positive and negative way.

We come now to the Incarnation itself. As we have already said, this is a fact of history. It cannot, however, be viewed as a result of any of its antecedent processes. It is not a fact coordinate in this way with other historical facts. It is the entrance of a new and higher creation, at once comprehending in itself the deepest sense of the whole world process, and thus capable of taking this up in its fallen and fragmentary character, and of carrying it on to its full completion. The conception of it, as a mystery of this character, must be based upon the consciousness which its own presence awakens. It reveals itself in the continuous evolution of its own contents, and is apprehended as life only as it apprehends. Through faith, it opens more and more of its infinite meaning to reason and will, and these, as it penetrates more and more the centre of our life, are made whole and free. It is not our purpose to discuss this mystery

here. We may say, in way of summary, that to Christian consciousness the Incarnation ever reveals itself as the absolute centre of the whole physical, moral, and supernatural world,—the glorious divine-wrought solution of the mystery of the whole universe. As such, it not only *properly* determines our conception of history, but *necessarily*, also, as determining history itself. The Word, who was the life and light of men, who was in the world, not incarnate, but yet controlling its whole movement towards such incarnation, *was made flesh*, and so entered the very constitution of the world's life—incorporated himself into the very movement of history, where he became the abiding principle of a new creative process, transcending the whole previous order of life, of which, however, it formed the crowning consummation.

To faith, therefore, history, from the Incarnation onward, is but the new creation in Christ, asserting its presence and power amidst the surrounding disorganization of sin, in a continuous series of crises or judgments, in which what is false and foreign to the idea of the world is met and condemned, while what is legitimate and capable of assimilation is taken up and moved onward to its perfection. In other words, it is the first advent of Christ continually, through the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, and in the living organism of the Church, unfolding itself into the second advent, in which the hitherto fragmentary world-process shall find eternal rest in the full realization of its idea.

The warrant of such issue rests in the profound truth, that in the person of Christ, we have in our human life, and hence we may say in the life of the world, the process itself already consummated. Here God and man are forever united: here the human organically from its conception onward through all its crises, through its whole life in the body, and through death, and through Hades, freed from wrath and from guilt, redeemed and atoned, reaches its glorious completion in rising victorious over every foreign element, and entering, body and soul, into its immortality.

"Hic est qui, carnis intrans ergastula nostræ,
Se pœnæ vinxit, vinctos ut solveret: æger
Factus, ut ægrotos sanaret; pauper ut ipsis
Pauperibus conferret opem; defunctus ut ipsâ
Vita donaret defunctos." (Alanus.)

As the very substance and source, in this way, of the salvation and victory, the life of Christ enters our life, and by the mutual indwelling of the two in the Spirit, "*I in them and they in me*," carries us also in such union onward through redemption and resurrection to glory. (Romans viii. 10–11). The form or organism in which this union and activity are objectively present and continuous in history is the Church. Here Christianity spreads out before us, itself a great sacramental mystery, having its ground in an incarnate and suffering and dying, but now risen and ever-present Redeemer; having its fullness through the descent of the Spirit in the Holy Catholic Church; coming into direct contact with our fallen humanity to redeem it in one baptism for the remission of sin; consciously apprehended, so far as apprehension be possible, by the gift of faith through which it authenticates itself, strengthening itself in us by a confirmation more than earthly, and nourished in us by more than manna, by the flesh and blood of a glorified Redeemer; answering our acknowledged contrition amidst wearying temptations and errors with its comforting pardon; crowning our worship with its hallowed benediction; covering every relation of life, from the cradle to the nuptial altar and the opened grave; moulding history; penetrating art, literature, and philosophy, and all the moral organism of our life, and moving on through conflict, yet with ever-conquering flow, until our ransomed humanity perfected shall see the descending New Jerusalem and enter the pearly gates and walk the golden streets and join the sounding hallelujahs of heaven. Modern history, or history from the first advent of Christ, is *Church history*. All else, from the very nature of the case, as in the presence of the absolute, is subordinate and measured by this. (Ephesians i. 22.)

This Christian conception of modern history we regard as of special importance, for, in the interest of infidelity and rationalism, a quite opposite conception has been rendered popular. In the great work of Gibbon, *e. g.* ("The History of the

Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire"), the whole narrative and argument fail at every point to bring out the real meaning of the ages of which they treat. The great crisis, in which Christianity, as a new and higher creation, is seen entering the wasting crumble of Heathen grandeur in the Roman Empire, to save its culture and civilization and power, and by sanctifying, use the whole in organizing and culturing the barbaric Teutonic tribes, giving to their fresh untutored vigor a tendency and tone, which otherwise could not have been theirs, and which made possible the now magnificent present of their national life,—this great crisis escapes his vision entirely, and in a cold-polished narrative he passes by, with an occasional sneer, the very central principle which alone could give any proper unity or force to his work. He sees no first-begotten of the dead, and prince of the kings of the earth, moving amidst the golden candlesticks, and hears no celestial trumpet saying, I am Alpha and Omega,—the first and the last.

This especially manifests itself where he attempts to account for the progress of the Christian Church (vol. I. ch. XV). The Christian religion, starting in Palestine, a remote province of the Roman Empire, and opposed by Judaism, on the one hand, and by Heathenism, on the other, in the course of three centuries so established itself throughout the vast bounds of the Roman State, as not only to be recognized, but also to be felt, to be the controlling movement of history. It were strange should no attempt be made to account for this. The mere statement of the fact is enough of itself to awaken inquiry, and challenge the most profound examination. Gibbon attempts to account for the fact in his own way, but fails entirely to understand the mystery and power of the Church, as through patient endurance and heroic martyrdom she takes up into her bosom the deep central current of the world's life, and becomes the great source and centre of advancing European civilization. He is able to survey the decline and fall of the old, but cannot, from his stand-point, adequately appreciate its resurrection and glorification in the new. The darkness seems to pass before his vision, and his eye, so accustomed to its presence, can-

not bear the sunlight which, dawning in the East, spreads out in increasing brightness over the world. A brief examination of the causes, which he regards as sufficient to account for the rapid growth of the early Church in the Roman empire, will sufficiently show this.

The primary cause of this growth, as assigned by Gibbon, is, "the convincing evidence of the doctrine itself, and the ruling providence of its great Author." Yet, as truth and providence do not act magically, but in the midst of the surrounding conditions of history, he develops the meaning of what he regards the primary cause, by discussing those called secondary, which, under five heads, he views as most effectually favoring such a historical result. 1st. "*The inflexible, and, if we may use the expression, the intolerant zeal of the Christians, derived, it is true, from the Jewish religion, but purified from the narrow and unsocial spirit which, instead of inviting, had deterred the Gentiles from embracing the law of Moses.*"

Inflexible purpose, and energy of action, especially when based upon a consciousness of justice, are in themselves powers of no ordinary character. These the primitive Christians had, as their lives and deaths everywhere testify. But it is not within the compass of zeal, however inflexible, to subordinate to its ends vast systems, which result from the processes of centuries. Zeal as *particular*—as *subjective*—as a condition of the active powers of men or bodies of men in reference to some definite end, can never set aside general organizations of history,—can never mould those general movements, which, from the accumulated results of the past, reach out into centuries to come, only as it has its own being and force in something higher than these organizations, and more general than these movements, and is directed to an end more profoundly in harmony with the aim of that providence under which the ages move. There was zeal also in the Jewish and Gentile world, stirred to its very depths, and arrayed against the zeal of Apostles and Martyrs and Confessors and Saints—zeal too, which had in its favor (at least in the consciousness of those who exercised it), the whole order of the civil and religious life of the world—

zeal which nailed Jesus to the cross, martyred his Apostles, and stretched every nerve to destroy the suffering, yet mysteriously growing Church—zeal truly inflexible and intolerant, not legitimately derived from the Jewish religion, but one with the false spirit into which that religion had degenerated. This cause then, however plausibly presented by Gibbon, must be felt to be not only *subordinate*, but absolutely *inadequate*,—powerless, we may say, as regards the great mystery of the spread of the Church during the first three centuries.

2d. "*The doctrine of a future life, improved by every additional circumstance which could give weight and efficacy to that important truth.*"

Zeal may be said to be in the sphere of will; doctrine, in the sphere of intellect. There may be zeal in propagating a doctrine; but, what Gibbon means, is, that the doctrine as advocated by the Church, is of such character as to have a force of persuasion in itself, convincing reason, arousing hopes and fears, and thus influencing the wills of men. This cause, in the discussion of the historian, involves also the peculiar eschatalogical views of the early Christians in reference to the coming of Christ in their generation. No one can question but that truth, uttered in a doctrine which comes so immediately into contact with all the solemn questionings of man's moral being, is in itself a great power. The fact, too, that the philosophy of Heathenism gave no secure footing for faith in the future state, and that in Judaism even, a misty veil is made to hang over Hades, may be regarded as a negative preparation for the reception of something more real and definite in reference to man's condition beyond the grave. In doctrine, however, as a mere abstract statement, addressed to the understanding of men, there is no power to transplant a doctrine already lodged there, and supported by traditions and strengthened by associations, only as the doctrine itself is grounded in some higher reality of being, which gives it power to authenticate itself in the reason as being so at one with its own fundamental law, as to challenge in this way the most free and ready assent. The doctrine of a future state as belonging to

Christianity, and the same as held by Jew or Gentile, stand precisely upon the same ground, unless in the one and not in the other, the doctrine is made to rest, not on a logical process or simple credence in an outward traditional revelation, but upon what may be called a concrete exhibition of it in life. The doctrine of the early Church in regard to the future state, was not the clearer enunciation of the immortality of the soul, surrounded with additional circumstances to give weight and influence to its truth; but, on the contrary, the doctrine was referred at once to the person of Christ, where death was really conquered, and resurrection and glorification in and for our humanity were actually reached. The doctrine had its ground in a *fact* of faith. The early Church did not put forward in her Creed any declaration like this, *I believe in the immortality of the soul*, and then attempt to surround this with arguments more potent than those given in the Phaedo of Plato. On the contrary, she challenged faith and not the understanding with the great supernatural mystery, "*On the third day He r se from the dead*," which necessitated the consequent declarations, "I believe in the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting." Now the mere doctrine of the future state, separate from this, its living ground, so as not to carry along with it the power of an endless life, cannot be regarded, with any degree of earnestness, as an adequate cause for its own widespread acceptance, especially when the Church never presented it in such form, and never enforced it in such abstract way. No doubt, it was from the very fact, that the *resurrection* and *life* were felt to be so centred in Christ's person, that the early Church continually watched for the coming of their Lord to unfold the very reality which their faith demanded. They erred in judgment as regards the time, but they erred not in holding firm the glorious and ever-impending supernatural reality "*he shall come again to judge the quick and the dead.*" The early Christians did not look forward to death simply, and then, as in its presence, try to realize the existence of that beyond, speculating about Acheron, Pyriphlegethon and Cocytus flowing across the pathway to Hades; they looked for the hallowed mys-

tery of that heavenly world into which Jesus had ascended, as itself to come in upon this order of life with overwhelming pomp and glory in the second Advent of Christ, giving to their struggles and martyrdoms their proper and crowning consummation. It was this, so vividly and continually before the vision of their faith, that swallowed up all mere chronological measurements, and made them stand ever on the threshold waiting with attentive ear to catch the herald cry: "*Lo, the Bridegroom cometh.*" Indeed, what is regarded their error in point of time, is the clearest evidence of the firmness and reality of their faith. Of course, all this Gibbon fails to see, and is busying himself about mere abstractions, and vainly supposing that a mere doctrine is gaining control of tendencies for ages. Neither zeal nor doctrine, both in their genesis subjective, can be regarded for a moment as covering the glorious compass of that divine commission under which the Christian Church labored and conquered.

3. "*The miraculous powers ascribed to the primitive Church.*" The mere fact that miraculous powers were *ascribed* to the primitive Church, can hardly be conceived as even a subordinate cause by any earnest mind. No system of religion has ever challenged the attention of mankind without the claim of miraculous powers accompanying it. Religion, to be such, must bring home to the consciousness the reality of the supernatural in some form. The wonderworks of Grecian and Scandinavian mythologies are familiar to all. In this respect, as being met by the supernatural in some way, every religion has an element of truth, and shows itself a necessary form of human life. The falsehood rests not in the claim, but in what is supposed really to meet it. Why then, we ask, should the claims of Christianity in this respect, set aside the claims of Heathenism itself? Why should the former sit arbitress, and fearlessly exorcise Gentile demons? If there was no reality in the miraculous powers of either the one or the other, as Gibbon with his earlier compeer, Celsus, seems to think, then the only advantage of the primitive Church over against Heathenism, must rest upon the superior cunning of its deceit.

Craft would be the power, and credulity the condition. This is a shameful travesty of history, a sort of idle profanity under the garb of calm philosophy. But even admit the miracles to be real, and not merely ascribed. In this case, the character of the miracle must be determined in relation to the reason and will of men before whom it is wrought. With the conception that by miraculous powers, the primitive Church forced men to assent, the miracle being the sudden overthrow of their free and conscious being, it might be possible perhaps to account for the increase of the Church. But no such miracles were ever claimed by, or ever ascribed to, the primitive Church. The miraculous, to be a convincing power over the false tendency of an age, must have its being in the supernatural as related to another tendency in whose interest teleologically it is wrought; and thus the question comes back again, how did the Christian Church come to possess such power and with it conquer, as opposed by the whole order of the world's culture and faith, unless in reality it embodied a tendency and power which met the deepest and truest sense of the world's history ideally considered?

There was a signal attempt, upon the part of Heathenism, to confront the whole miraculous element of Christianity with a bold counterpart. A certain Hierocles, taking up the legends and prodigies, which, through a memoir recast by Philostratus, had been made to surround the career of a certain Appolonius, much in the form of a parody on the life of Christ, challenged with them the faith of the world with as good a right, he thought, as the Church did, in making use of the Gospel narratives of Christ. The parody barely remains in fragmentary relics in the writings of Eusebius and Lactantius, while the heavenly melodies of the great poem, which it was supposed to rival, still touch the chords of thousands of enraptured hearts.

4. "*The pure and austere morals of the Christians.*" Were men, in the sphere of nature and surrounded by systems of religious life illy calculated to inspire self-sacrifice, humility and repentance, in favorable condition to receive an opposing sys-

tem of religion just because of its direct opposition to their natural bias and habits of culture, this assigned cause might appear to have some force. But such is not the case. The purity and austerity of the early Christians aroused against them the sinful animus of the whole age. But again, the morality of the early Christians must itself be accounted for. Upon what base did *it* stand, and how came it into being in such an age, as something quite distinct from the whole order of Heathen life around it? Gibbon say, it rested upon "*repentance for their past sins, and the laudable desire of supporting the reputation of the society in which they were engaged.*" Repentance is negative in its character. It is a consciousness of transgression and condemnation covering the whole life, a sense of insupportable vanity and worthlessness, and of no positive force as such, unless it find completion in submission to what is felt to be a power of deliverance through supernatural grace. Cyprian in his letter to Donatus beautifully confesses this great truth so familiar to the Christianity of his day. "I lay in darkness and blind night, tossed about on the sea of this disturbed life, and dubious I wandered on bewildered, not knowing my life, and a stranger to truth and light. * * * But when, by the aid of regenerating water, the sins of my past life were washed away, serene and pure light from above poured in upon me, * * and in a wonderful manner doubts were cleared up, mysteries were opened, darkness illumined, and power granted to accomplish what before had seemed difficult and impossible." This whole conception of supernatural power, as a new inward principle of life, and thus the very base of Christian morality, Gibbon quietly passes over, and makes the positive element accompanying repentance to be, "the laudable desire of supporting the reputation of a society." This in fact overthrows the very idea of morality, making it a means to an end, and the principle in such form could have no permanent force of obligation. A morality of this kind has no world-conquering power in it. It rests upon no true base, depending upon a sense of sin followed by a sort of utilitarian pride. The morality of the early Christians, as distinct from that of the sur-

rounding world, moved in the sphere of a higher religious consciousness, and may be regarded as the result of a new creative life, entering the will and filling it with holy strength and activity, entering the intellect and bringing into clear consciousness the truth, and making possible the development of doctrines transcending mere philosophy, entering the very centre of life and giving it power both to see and to realize its proper end. In this great movement of new-creating life, this sacramental mystery of heavenly powers reaching our being, the morality of the early Christians was a force invincible: but separate from this it could have no effect in moulding the culture of ages.

5. "*The union and discipline of the Christian republic, which gradually formed an independent and increasing state in the heart of the Roman empire.*" An organized system, into the midst of which men are born and live, and which, as a general power surrounding them, subsumes their whole activity, such as a State or an established Church, and whose unity is one of spirit and form, and whose discipline is both exercised and acknowledged, is beyond question a reality of such force as to warrant the assertion that it will prove effective for its own ends. But the primitive Church was an organized system in the midst of other opposing systems, whose hold upon mankind had been continued for ages. Gibbon seems to regard the Church as an independent State within the empire. This very consideration only increases the difficulty of determining how it finally subordinated the empire itself, how it came to control other counter-systems until they were reorganized under its power.

It is vain to attempt to find in either or in all of these assigned causes anything at all adequate to account for the rapid growth of the Christian Church. The effort is but playing with history. It is a mere array of isolated facts, gathered here and there, without any true appreciation of the grand movement and power of life in which they came to utter themselves. The whole narrative proceeds under a wrong conception of history itself; and yet how much of the same kind meets us year after year!

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES

Now from another and proper stand-point, what do we see passing before our view in the advance of the Christian Church? As facts patent to observation, we see an infant Church struggling with a surrounding evil world. We see her, conscious of the possession of a supernatural life which is to gain ultimate victory over all opposing forces, and expecting for this end the speedy coming of her Lord and head, patiently enduring persecution, and sealing her testimony with blood. We see her growing in spite of every antagonism, defending herself against the literary attacks of Heathenism, and giving birth to an apologetic literature truly sublime in contrast with that which it opposed. We see her examining with vigorous thought the content of her own faith, and securing the foundations of world-enduring creeds, and a wondrous structure of theology. We see her consolidating her organization, and becoming a vast united power in the State, establishing her orders, and worship and practical life with all the freshness of youthful vigor, and with the bold swing of conscious power. We see her meeting the various pre-Christian systems of religious thought which were pressing in upon her from every quarter, and which were drawn on, we may say, by the vast stimulus of her own new and higher principle, yet threatening, on the one hand, to supplant her theology in its distinctiveness, or, on the other, to deform it by foreign admixture. We see her not only meeting all this perilous host of Gnosticism, but also actually sifting the old philosophies and theosophies with her absolute criticism, assimilating all that was allied to her own truth, and casting off all that was alien. We see her in every contest still advancing with the glorious light of victory upon her banner, entering into all the operations of the Roman empire, moulding its laws and habits of action, covering in this way the whole sphere of Grecian and Roman civilization, holding up for a time the crumbling edifice of the Cæsars, till gaining free course for her onward development, and gathering up the world's disciplined resources, she might meet the invading barbarians of the North and christianize and civilize them, and make use of their fresh, impetuous energy for renewed con-

quests of the world. We see all this and more, and is our conception of history such that no satisfactory answer can be given to the question, *What is the ground of it?*

The proper answer is to be found in the following profound statements of St. Paul: first, where the purpose of God in history is said to be, "that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ," (Ephesians i. 10): and second, where this purpose is viewed as an accomplished fact, "he hath put all things under his feet and gave him to be head over all things to the Church." (Ephesians i. 22).

In the first of these inspired statements, the various movements of history are regarded as having a divine aim in view. Only in the reality of such aim can there be any proper organic relation of these movements as reaching out to one central completion, any real *πληρωμα των καιρων*. This aim, through the divine will, becomes a guiding law, a *home-law* (*οικονομα*), under which all tendencies look forward to a certain consummation in which, of course, their own true idea can alone be grasped, and their relative orbits rightly assigned. This consummation, towards which every process is made to look consciously or unconsciously as regards the human factor involved, and toward which every process is made to reach positively or negatively, is the gathering into unity under one head (*ανακεφαλαιωσις*) of all the several elements of the world's life in Christ. The development of the Roman State, therefore, a world-process whose magnitude is truly wonderful, was not brought about as though a drifting mass of elements, by some outward force or inherent affinity became consolidated to revolve at random without any end or aim in that divine *pronoia* under which the ages move. On the contrary, there was profound meaning in the whole movement, although the disorganizing presence of sin necessitated its overthrow in so far as it assumed wrong relation to the mystery of Christianity in which alone it could come to have any permanent force or claim of continuance. Christianity, as being one with the divine law of history, as being the very life rather in which history is to be

recapitulated and carried on to its right consummation, cannot but gain ultimate mastery over every world-power. The Roman State had reached that crisis, when its inefficiency, as based upon a nature-development alone, was becoming fully manifest. The time had come when for the very preservation of its preceding centuries of labor and conflict something higher was demanded, and hence the new order of life in the Church so rapidly swept over it.

In the second of the above quotations from St. Paul, the headship of Christ over the Church is made to involve, in way of subordination, his headship over all powers and principalities. The latter is for the former. He is head over all things *for the Church*, just as in the apostolic communion, "all power is given to me in heaven and on earth, go ye, *therefore*." The resurrection and ascension were to open the way for just such a supernatural reality in history as the holy catholic Church. All powers are under the Saviour's dominion, as the Alpha and Omega, and the Prince of the kings of the earth. The decline and fall of all world-systems is, in the unfolding of history towards its consummation, but their subordination to higher ends than can be reached in themselves. Their very efforts to live and their death-throes are so many voices crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord.

It is only from this standpoint, also,—this full recognition of the presence of the supernatural,—that we can rightly understand the persecutions which the Church endured. Christianity, in claiming to be the absolute religion, claimed by virtue of this the right to set aside all other religions. It could not and be true to its character, combine with them: neither could it be indifferent to the fact of their existence. Had other religions, as relative, felt the true force of this claim, and seen how their own deepest meaning was met in Christianity, they might have yielded without struggle and conflict. But this seems to have been beyond their capacity, and contrary to their disposition, and they arrayed themselves for self-preservation, as they vainly supposed, against the growing Church.

The Roman empire controlled the whole order of religious

life within its bounds. We may say, indeed, that religion had become a State institution among the Romans, so over-mastering had been the tendency of Heathenism world-ward. It is true that in the way of policy some of the conquered nations were allowed to keep their ancient religious rites; but the permission only shows the absolute control which the State claimed to exercise in this sphere. From this connection of religion with the State, the claim of Christianity to set aside other religions would of necessity involve, if carried out, the subversion of the State under its then existing form. Hence the conflict of Christianity with the prevailing religious life of the people, would connect more or less opposition against itself from the civil authority. It must be remembered here, however, that while Christianity claimed as its legitimate mission to set aside all other religions, it did so only on the ground of the superior force of its own absolute truth. It did not array itself as a revolutionary element against the empire, forcing its way to recognition by disobedience to law, by incitements to insurrection, or by hurrying to arms. On the contrary, with an endurance truly wonderful, and with a patience never surpassed, the Christians of the second and third centuries allowed their work to progress, and in its own silent and sure development show itself more general and more mighty than aught which assailed it. Nothing, therefore, we may unhesitatingly say, in the outward acts of the Church, could possibly justify the bitter and malignant persecutions which it endured from the Roman empire for a long series of years. It is important then to ask why the Roman civilization took such a stand of deadly hostility against it? No proper answer can be given by a mere survey of scattered facts. Our conception of history must be able to grasp what underlies the facts, before they can be seen in their true character. The standpoint which we take will inevitably determine our analysis and result.

The Roman State, as well as the religious life animating it, was of an exclusively heathen character. It was a world-power—the result of a development from the basis of mere nature,

where the original tendency of man towards God, not met by direct revelation, was so overwhelmed by an inclination to the world, as to lose almost, if not entirely, the supernatural in the mere idea of policy and government. The vast array of its gods had ceased to carry with them any serious claim to the supernatural. The whole order of worship had become a mere tool in the hands of the State. Those germs of faith which are enclosed in all heathen religions had become so corrupted that obedience to the State had become the very measure of obedience to the gods. Cicero even declares that the gods who are to be worshipped must be recognized by statute. The nation made and unmade its deities. Vespasian when dying exclaims, as quoted by Pressense, "wo to me! I am going to become a god!"

In saying that the Roman empire and religion formed what may be termed an exclusively world-power, we involve the statement that they had in so far become elements of that prevailing tendency of disintegration, the object of which is the subjection of the Divine to the power and law of sin. They were fully in an æon,—a circle of tendencies, in which the prince of this world was working to set aside the government and grace of God. How far the Roman citizen may have been conscious or unconscious of this, does not affect the statement. The tendency so general and controlling, apprehended all with more or less power, and carried the whole force and spirit of the empire onward towards its own bad ends. All this, however, as already intimated, is in itself the very judgment in which the whole reality of Roman culture was put under the feet of Christ; or rather it is the movement which must end in such crisis or prove a wild, colossal failure. The old Apologists and Fathers of the Church are full of this thought. They may not express it in just this form, but it underlies their frequent statement, that evil demons ruled the whole idolatry of Rome.

Now Christianity, on the other hand, was in no sense a world-power of this character. Its base was not in the natural, but in the supernatural. That tendency of man towards God,

which springs primarily from the very constitution of his being as man, but which through sin had been violently distorted, and bent earthward, was met by the very reality towards which it was made to look, a reality coming from the heavenly world, viz., the Incarnation of the Word, through which, in the person of Christ, God and man were brought together in full life communion. The Christian, therefore, conscious that in Christ he had found God, was conscious also that he had reached the absolute religion, in the presence of which every other tendency must yield and give away. In the profound depths of such higher consciousness, in which full satisfaction had dawned upon his spirit, he was impelled as by the force of his own constitution to assert that his faith must conquer the world. Indeed this higher consciousness may rightly be regarded as such victory itself, according to the profound language of St. John, (1 Epistle v. 4, 5).

The Christian Church stood forth, therefore, as belonging to that tendency both of the natural and supernatural, interpenetrating each other, more general than all other tendencies of the world's history, whose ultimate end is the full harmony of the creation with its Creator, the full renovation and restoration and perfection organically of the world. It was no separate æon, as belonging to the order of the world, in which the Christian Church stood, but in the æon of æons, in the sæculum sæculorum, the head and organizing principle of which was, "He for whom God made the world," (*τους αιωνας*). The early church writers ever kept before them this truth. They could see nothing in the order of the world's life surrounding them but what was felt to be passing away. Their peculiar conception of the immediate advent of Christ is only an evidence of this, growing out of the felt contradiction which the world presented to their faith.

These two great systems, so opposite on account of the presence of sin, were coming together. The light confronted the darkness, and the solemn crisis had come. The hours of judgment were coming to their close. The serpent and the Seed of the woman were actually face to face in struggle. The very

deeps of the evil world with its antichristian prince, were stirred by the presence of the life of the Holy One. Hence the terrible onset. Hence the opened gates of hell, and the garments of saints rolled in blood. Only in a view like this can we reach any adequate or correct idea of the terrible persecutions of the Roman empire which poured out the blood of a noble army of martyrs, only, however, to fertilize the mustard plant whose roots were fastening themselves in the life of the ages. Only in a view like this can we appreciate the solemn spectacle of suffering saints, standing on the very verge of the earthly, and gazing towards the heavens, from whence they await their Lord, with the sweet and ecstatic prayer "*even so, come Lord Jesus.*" The persecutions were the death-struggles of thrones and principalities long usurped against Him under whose feet they were being placed.

> "Highly they raged
> Against the Highest, and fierce with grasped arms
> Clashed on their sounding shields the din of war
> Hurling defiance toward the vault of Heaven."

It must not be inferred from what we have just said of this necessary conflict between Heathenism and Christianity, that the Church herself was in no sense conditioned by the order of history through which she was moving, and in which her life was developing itself. The supernatural in her constitution is all the while most intimately inwoven with the natural. The Church, not a stiff mechanical formation, but a mysterious supernatural organism, is in fact realizing her own idea in her developing process in the world, and at the same time realizing also the idea of the world, as its movements become penetrated and controlled by her life. The process is organic. The life of Christ, through the Holy Ghost is the informing principle, and human life with all its varying relations is the element in which the principle continually embodies itself. But human life is characterized by intelligence and will, and hence the process, if organic and not the mere working of a power, which from without and in no union with its material, acts only upon it, must move forward as the principle of it on the one hand

apprehends, and, on the other, is apprehended. The Church, therefore, is not what may be termed a developed and fixed formation, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter, but involves growth and eras and epochs of development. "Built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together *groweth* unto an holy temple in the Lord." (Ephesians ii. 20). In her constitution then is a wide compass of tendencies to be reconciled, which are not at once necessarily in harmony, but often diverging as representing, however, in this or that direction, fragmentary apprehension of the one great central truth and life. The development of such tendencies, even when not in harmony, does not set aside the unity of the process itself. This unity is a living progressive reality, and not a dead, monotonous fixedness, organic in the way of life, and not mechanical in the way of mere fixed and outward proportions. The various tendencies in development do not, we repeat, in their separate character, represent the whole truth of which the Church is the ground and pillar, but rather the different stages of its apprehension in the sphere of human life. They serve, however, to bring about a clearer consciousness of the absolute truth, which the Church possesses at all times as germ developing its contents, and in this way reach out to a higher ground of development than that occupied by either tendency alone, in which at last they find their reconciliation, and the current then moves on with greater force and wider compass. It may be, in consequence of the sinful order of the yet unrenovated world, that these tendencies will in part refuse to yield to the higher position onward towards which they have served to help the process. They are then of necessity set aside as heresies, if in the sphere of thought, and schisms, if in the sphere of will, and thereafter, as a vanquished form of antichrist, fall away because lacking historical substance, and having served their purpose as controlled by God.

The actual world, into whose history the life of Christ was to penetrate, was already a result of vast antecedent systems of culture. We have already mentioned these systems under the

relative antithesis of Judaism and Heathenism. Both these, if not passing beyond their own idea and type, are of course, in full antagonism to Christianity, in which alone either can find unity. Yet both, as being apprehended by the absolute in Christianity, but apprehending this only imperfectly and in a form in which their own previous culture was ever asserting itself, opened the way for two diverging tendencies within the bosom of the Church. The Church instinctively conscious that their ultimate issue must be measured by their relation to that which was most fundamental in the intuition of her faith, viz., the person of Christ, fully reconciled them by reaching in her positive advance a clearer consciousness of what that Person involved, and, by establishing her trinitarian creed, she left behind her the tendencies themselves, which, in so far as they yielded, not to the position gained, fell away in the heresies of Ebionism and Gnosticism, a large, but vanquished foe. In Gnosticism, indeed, we have all the forms of pre-Christian religious philosophy, struggling to perpetuate themselves by combining with Christianity. They seemed to have a more or less clear consciousness that they could be perpetuated only in such combination; and this shows at once that Christianity itself was confronting the world with a new order of life and thought, which were now so powerfully making themselves felt through the Church, as to necessitate a reconstruction of these pre-Christian religious philosophies in reference to it. The historical meaning of such a vast movement as that represented by Gnosticism is to be found in just this, that it marks the process through which, on the one hand, the absolute truth of Christianity was eliminating errors from the developing theology of the Church, and through which on the other hand, that which was of worth in the world's philosophy was preserved by being assimilated and brought into the sphere of Christian life and knowledge. In this very process the Christian truth was showing itself, in a historical way, as the absolute, and therefore, as covering the entire compass of intellectual activity, as a philosophy in germ, in whose development all philosophy, as belonging essentially to human life, should find its own deepest sense

met and realized. This whole inward movement and perilous advance was historical. It cannot be properly appreciated, if on the one hand, Christianity is not recognized as a power of life bringing the objective supernatural really in to the sphere of human thinking, or if, on the other, its absolute truth is regarded as dropped down from the clouds in developed and immovable fixedness. It is through just such crises, as we have said, through just such processes of sifting judgment, and unfolding inwardly and outwardly, that in history and as history, the first advent of Christ is moving into the second. "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." (1 Corinthians xiii. 9, 10).

Not only have we in the Church such an inward process through which her own apprehension of the truth takes positive form in dogma, but also and in conjunction with this, as already intimated, a process in which the essential unity of the Church reveals itself in rejecting schism. The authority exercised in both cases is after all one and the same in its ground, and the outward form of the Church in creed and dogma, is no more real than the outward form in government. One without the other would be found to be entirely ineffectual. Both because in the organism of the Church in which the life and authority of Christ are unfolding their contents, have their proper reality. We may say that in either case it is the life of the Church in its exercise, *i. e.*, this life uttering itself through divinely appointed organs in the form of authority. The dogma and government of the Church, however, can never be said to be fully commensurate with the absolute in these forms, until the absolute truth and law, in apprehending human life, have within its sphere raised it into an equivalent apprehension of themselves. Then only in the objective truth and law the subjective reason and will find their very home and rest. The movement towards this end is the very process in which the Church is realizing her idea and carrying the world to its completion; and the authority, in either case to which we have referred, must show itself a result conditioned all the while by the

historical development through which the Church is progressing. Neither a completed dogma, nor a fixed and completed form of government drops down from the clouds, to be assumed by the Church as a something having no inward organic relation to her life as developing in the world. Nothing of such character comes from Christ. He did not, like some divine lawgiver, at once and by statute-form, fix for the Church modern Presbyterianism or Anglican Episcopacy, or Roman Catholic Papacy. Such action, as outside of history itself, would be in direct opposition to the relation of the Divine and human in his person, and come in the end to a Gnostic denial of the reality of the Incarnation. The living base from which a developed dogma could arise, and from which a developed form of government could be established is most certainly involved in the commission of Christ; but the authority of either as developed therefrom must authenticate itself in our life, and come to be of moral force, not certainly by setting aside the very characteristic of that life, viz., moral freedom, but by showing itself to be the utterance of a real constitution of grace, in which individual reason and will find the very sphere of their highest and freest activity. Reason and will overwhelmed by mere outward force, give no obedience, but the very degradation of slavery.

We have premised these remarks to show that the papal hierarchy which confronts us in history has its proper ground of defence, only in the fact that it is a result, in the developing life of the Church as conditioned by the surrounding order of history, in which the continuous authority of a divinely commissioned ministry came in such force to actualize itself. This view by no means deprives the ministry of its distinctive character as continually having its ground in the risen Christ. Neither does it set aside what is called the Apostolic succession, but rather gives to it proper historical force as reaching over from age to age in a real and not abstract way. The Church does not develop a ministry, as though commencing without one in a sort of free aggregation of individuals who might for social convenience or for didactic interests select a head. On

the contrary, in the development of the Church, the ministry, as a real and essential organ of her life, expands itself, preserving within itself by ordination its distinctive character from age to age, while at the same time applying its authority in a real way to the conditions of history.* More reality is given to the Papacy by this view, than by that which regards it as a fixed form handed down by Christ and in no sense mediated by the advancing life of the Church herself. This view also maintains for it that peculiar historical force which it most certainly showed itself to have in the relation of the Church to the new barbaric element which broke in upon the old Roman empire. To this new crisis, in which the Church is to show her world comprehending activity we now turn.

In the Roman empire, Christianity came into contact with an order of culture and civilization which had already come to maturity. With imperial law Rome governed the historical world, and Greece had before gained the same mastery in the way of philosophy and art. Both, however, had no power to preserve themselves in the forms which they had assumed. They were passing away. Before the wild torrents pouring in upon them from the barbaric North, they would have been swept off in all

* The universal priesthood of believers, held in a sense which would exclude the distinctive function of the ministry, making this a creation from below, and not a power flowing from Christ, and perpetuated sacramentally by ordination is, we believe, a pure fabrication, not found in the word of God. Indeed the universal priesthood of the N. T. is itself such a presentation of the supernatural superiority of the Christian Church over against the O. T. theocracy, as to clothe the order and organic functions of the former only with more overwhelming authority rather than the contrary; and hence the Apostolate transcends in its mysterious official relation to the heavenly world, the whole scope of priest and prophet going before, because having to do directly with the very realities of the heavenly world and not with shadows and types thereof. The prophetic and priestly and kingly offices of Christ are not separate functions disconnected with the mystery of his divine human life, as though he had assumed them merely to fulfil what had gone before. They are the very forms in which that life must utter its own reality. To suppose then for a moment that Christ's presence in the Spirit does not from the very nature of the case perpetuate their mysterious reality in history, is simply to deny in the end that that life comes to any real authentication of itself in the world. The N. T. Scriptures are themselves the outflow of the prophetic function of the ministry itself as ordained by Christ. "And he gave some, apostles and some, prophets, and some, evangelists, and some pastors, and teachers." (Ephesians iv. 10, 11).

probability as cumbrous wrecks, if dependent upon their own power of resistance and defence. How could they stand before the pent-up storm bursting in upon them from over the Alps and Pyrenees? The Church, however, gathered up into her bosom what otherwise in these forms must have yielded and crumbled away. Not that in her constitution, in this way, the human was set aside, and no longer kept its identity. Christianity did not become, it is true, simply Roman civilization and Roman policy; but these now found in the fact of their assimilation by it, their own distinctive characteristics still preserved, to be made only more efficient and active in the transition to something higher. Grecian philosophy and Roman rule, the vast theoretical and practical results of two great and distinctly characterized tendencies of history, were not, and indeed could not be, arbitrarily set aside by the Church. This is evident at once from the fact, that within her bosom they were really preserved in their peculiar distinctiveness. The actual movement of the Church in the Grecian sphere was predominantly inward and speculative. Here in the Greek language, itself a philosophy and art, and in that life of peculiar inward thoughtfulness so characteristic of those to whom this language was vernacular, the new creation wrought, constructing that theology, and Christology and pneumatology, which, in depth of speculation and artistic finish of expression, challenge the admiration, and almost set at defiance the criticism, of the present age. Here the philosophic spirit of ages, through no forced exorcism of itself, nor in passive indifference, but penetrated and made even more active by the divine revelation, yields to the new creation which apprehends it, and yields in *active* obedience, moulding the contents of faith into classic forms for thought. The Church, no less really in the sphere of Roman life also, took up the practical world with its distinctive characteristics. Her own movement here shows the same conditioning presence of the life she apprehended. The interests of will, the organization, and consolidation of government, and the more practical investigations of anthropology and soteriology, here continually come into sharp articulation. The whole

Roman type of life is still preserved. Thus the Church did not stand apart from the order of history which confronted her in the Greek and Roman worlds, as though by some ghostly and magical power, she must, to authenticate her presence, level all before her; but she entered in most living way into their very organism, took up their spirit, and thus made the old creation continually resurgent in the new. She showed herself possessed with a life truly all-comprehensive, just because she could really retain the two in their undisturbed distinctiveness, and at the same time hold them together in the deeper and broader base of her own constitution. In her bosom, indeed, all the great powers and processes of human life in history must come together in the unity of a life so comprehensive and so intensely human, that their peculiarities are not lost, but found to be no longer dissevered fragments, but real co-efficient elements of one great living organism.

When the Church had thus gathered up into her own bosom the characteristic culture of both Greece and Rome, there came on to the stage of history a new power, in direct antithesis, we may say, with that of the Roman empire, viz., the barbaric element of the North. Both in their origin were heathen; but the one, when confronted by Christianity, a developed result, the other, a fresh and vigorous life not yet developed into any mature or settled organic form. It was no mere accident that, as thus conditioned, the two came at this time to meet in conflict, when the Church was so well qualified to become the great mediating power. Having already entered the old, taking up and preserving what was of real historical force in it, the Church, now strong and fully organized, was prepared to meet the new, and to penetrate and carry on the development of the vast and rude elementary forces of modern Europe.

We have already remarked that history does not move in self-repeating cycles. The old may be taken up by the new, but not as an outward form which is to be the necessary measure of its own life and contents. The civilization of the barbaric tribes, when having come to its maturity, cannot be the same as the old civilization of the Roman empire. It would

be contrary to all right conception of history and of the Church, to suppose that the Teutonic and Slavic North should engross centuries of vast activity, and take up under Christianity the very central current of the world's life, only to retard the whole progress of development by coming to be in the end nothing more than a mere copy of Greece and Rome. They had their own mission (not yet accomplished even), their own historical future, their own higher results to reach in the onward march of ages. The Church, therefore, as involving in herself the central principle of the world's true movement,—the life and power in which alone history can reach its proper end, could not but authenticate her presence and activity through all the varying crises of the barbaric world. On the base of a national antithesis between the developed Roman civilization in the Church, and the independent and undeveloped barbarism, there arises an entirely new relation between the Church and the world. The Church, now fully organized, with a developed system of dogma, with a consolidated hierarchy, and with all the finished forms of Roman and Grecian culture, the language and legislation, the philosophy and art, of the Roman empire, in so far as these were taken up by her life,—the Church, we repeat, as a fully organized power in history, came now to stand face to face with impetuous tribes, whose whole order of life was in formation, whose boundless self-will was struggling, as a vast independent force, towards something quite distinct from imperial Rome. This new spirit and power, opening the way for its development in history, must have place in Christianity,—must find room in the Church to bring its own mission to a proper solution. The Church must prove herself comprehensive enough to hold in her constitution the Christianized Teutonic world without setting aside, in so doing, its distinctive and historical import. The whole development of the barbaric tribes was stimulated of course by the finished culture and civilization which confronted them, and was conducted within the organism of the Church: yet ever on the base of their own new and peculiar spirit did it move onward. We find, it is true, at the close of the first period of advance,

in the barbaric world in the sphere of politics, the vast empire of Karl the great. Yet in this form, we have no mere continuation of the old Roman life. Everywhere was manifest the presence of a new spirit in activity, which quickly dismembered the vast dominion, and made its broken fragments germs of new national developments. Rather, we may say, these germs, already enclosed in the Frankish monarchy, necessitated its dissolution. The bonds which held them together were outward, and the unity of the empire itself not an organic growth, but something imposed by the brilliant genius of Karl himself. Hegel well styles the whole political system of Charlemagne "an *a priori* constitution, something superficially induced and not based upon the spirit of the people,—not having become a vital element in it." Interpenetrating, however, at every point, this colossal monarchy, was the ecclesiastical hierarchy centered in the Pope, and challenging and gaining the submission of the people. The former (the empire) we see dissolving and giving room for the free play of separate national life. The latter (the papacy) we see maintaining still its form and increasing its authority to control the issue of such dismemberment, and hold in check so far as possible the forces which were at work. Tumultuary as these forces were, yet there was meaning and aim in their agitated movement. They formed not merely a negative process, breaking up all authority and unity, but mark in reality a significant struggle through ages to reach a unity more real, in which the general and individual might be in harmony,—in which the authority of the one might not ever stand in an arbitrary overthrow of the other, giving only an obedience of slavery, but both meet in reconciliation,—*a struggle toward freedom.** This seems to have been the historical

* Of course, from a mere survey of the period in which these forces were in tumultuous and apparently almost chaotic confusion, one might easily fail to see their underlying aim and tendency: but there must be embraced in such survey a more advanced period wherein they come to characterize more distinctly their meaning and purpose. This is by no means an unhistorical method of investigation, but the only one which can satisfy at all an inquiring reason. Who, e. g. in merely surveying the developing activities of a plant, in its first elementary stages of growth, can come to any full consciousness of the aim of its movement, without he first discover from its blossoming and maturity a centre from which the whole antecedent movement becomes intelligible to thought.

problem, especially of the Germanic world: and hence, as a sphere for its active solution, Germany, most inflexibly bound to the old barbaric type or spirit, as is evident from its persistent preservation of the vernacular language, became not long after the dismemberment of the Frankish empire, the central political power rather than either France or Italy. It must not be supposed that this struggling Germanic spirit was essentially antagonistic to Christianity. Though in frequent conflict with the peculiar tendency of the Papacy, it had however entered fully into the organism of the Church,—and with the capacity also of forming an element there, in which Christianity might come to a still higher stage of development in the sphere of human life. While Christianity is authority, and that of the most absolute character, it is also freedom in its deepest and broadest sense. It gives room for the very highest individuality by realizing for every personality, as a thought of God, its true distinctive perfection. Indeed only in Christianity can there be true freedom,—a full unity of law and will, of truth and reason, in life; and hence the Germanic spirit, as poised towards freedom, could never accomplish its appointed mission except in the Church and in the spirit and life of faith.

Within the bosom of the Church, therefore, we have two tendencies, both from the conditions of history necessary, yet with the possibility, and we may say with the necessity of reconciliation, viz., a tendency towards independence, or rather towards freedom on the side of the individual or subjective, a sense of which formed an underlying element of the whole Teutonic world from the start: and a tendency in which an already organized authority is holding the other tendency in check. These tendencies might come into direct antagonism, when, in the one, the struggle towards freedom should move towards lawlessness or mere self-will, or when, in the other, the organized authority should assert itself as outward and arbitrary, moving towards tyranny.

No one, we think, can fail to perceive these two tendencies throughout the Middle Ages, in more or less bold antagonism with each other. As evidence of this, we must rapidly survey

the process of history from the time of Charlemagne to the close of the Middle Ages, yet with such necessary brevity as to run the risk both of being misunderstood and misrepresented. The dismemberment of the Frankish empire of Charlemagne, to which we have already referred, shows the restlessness of the barbaric world under such outward restraint. The division of the vast dominion was no mere dynastic act. It was the repressed activities of nationalities bursting the fetters imposed upon them by a dominion in which they could gain no proper sphere for their own energies, and in which their growing consciousness of their mission could not satisfy itself. In his scheme, "grand and benevolent as it was, Karl was overborne by the tendencies of his times. All the deeper impulses of the nations were towards independence rather than unity; he could not reverse or control them; Germany was stronger than Rome, feudalism than imperialism. The sublimest legislative genius can do no more than arrest for a moment the great currents of social force." (Parke Godwin's Ancient Gaul) The oath at Strasburg, between Louis and Charles and their respective subjects, shows, from the fact of its not being in Latin, but in the Romance tongue for the one party, and in the German (undeveloped) for the other, that a France and Germany were fast organizing. Indeed, the treaty at Verdun between the three kings shows already a distinctive Germany and France and Italy. The empire, as a sort of outward plan, after the old Roman type, was in fact a compulsory union of elements too independent and self-willed to be thus held together. The barbaric impulse not incompatible with, but really stimulated by, Christianity, was not towards such arbitrary unity, but towards freedom, a freedom, however, not yet clearly distinguished from a mere following of its own impetuous self-will. As yet, therefore, the central and controlling hierarchy of the Church was essential to hold together, under the proper restraint of an objective, divine kingdom, this necessary but perilous disintegration. It continued in its form, and naturally concentrated and increased its authority more and more to meet the surrounding conditions of history, but en-

dangered at the same time its capacity and disposition under such form, to reconcile instead of overriding the deep, earnest, struggling spirit itself. Imperialism gave way, and the freed elements sought mutual protection and self-defence in what was more congenial, viz., Feudalism. But Feudalism could not satisfy the aroused spirit of the nations. In its caprice and violence, made even more wide-spread by its necessary individualization of power, the tyranny of Feudalism was no less arbitrary than that of Imperialism; and a wilder play even of passions and self-will was the inevitable result. The Church, in the midst of this social disintegration, sought an independence for itself, and came into conflict with the secular power, and now there seemed to be but one issue possible, viz., chaos and anarchy. Endangering the possibility of her own proper interpenetration of the spirit of the age struggling towards something politically more real and free, and yet within her own organism, the Church, by a kind of historical necessity maintained and advanced her authority, covering with it all the relations of politics and science and art, and reaching out, through Hildebrand, to a world-embracing theocracy, enclosing within itself the whole religious and civil life of the nations, but under such an outward sway as to ignore almost entirely the moral sphere in which men while obedient must be freely so by not losing the activity of their own reason and will. The Hildebrandian policy could not succeed, however, without most earnest and bitter conflict. Hildebrand himself dies in exile, and only as the nations, worn out with intestine warfare, are diverted from the more inward problem of their own life, in a sort of wild enthusiasm, to the most external in the interest of Christianity, viz., to the recovery of the Holy Land, did his policy gain temporary victory. In the Crusades, the Church gained her highest point of external authority, but not by a true interpenetration of the Germanic world with that living spirit of Christianity in which its own spirit might find itself qualified to go onward in the completion of its mission. Through conflicts and defeats, by councils and by diets, the Germanic spirit still sought to realize its proper contents. We see em-

perors, and princes, and knights, and free cities, and peasants, all in resisting authority, seeking liberty and authority for themselves; and in the fifteenth century, the subordinate powers rally against both Emperor and Pope, to reach a constitution and monarchy, in which there should be law and reason, and not mere irresponsible power. The whole movement of the Germanic world was, we may say, when rightly viewed, although within the Church, towards a freedom which was sought in vain in either Church or State in their then organized forms.

If we now turn to the sphere of theology, we shall see a process in which a kindred antagonism manifests itself. The Church confronted the barbaric world with a system of dogma, already developed, and through most serious activity of thought. The dogma thus to the rude and untutored barbarian, came from without and was at first acquiesced in without much inward assimilation, as having already reached its form through severe intellectual struggles. This legacy the barbaric world received. But this was not enough. Its spirit must in the end make it truly its own by an inward apprehension of its truth. In Scholasticism we have an effort to give to it a scientific form to bring it into the schools, under the full conviction, however, that it was the absolute truth. Even here we see a tendency to make the external dogma more inward by rendering it intelligible to thought. Scholasticism stimulated inquiry, while in one sense it was designed to repress it. It was an impulse of science, and roused the intellect and set it into activity. Abelard with his "*Sic et non*" no more stimulated inquiry by endeavoring to bring confusion into the opinions of the Fathers, than did Peter, the Lombard, by endeavoring to compile the same into a harmonious system. This process, however, never satisfied the German mind, and we find it predominantly characterizing the Romanic nations, in whom the old barbaric type had to a great extent disappeared. (Die Philosophie des Mittelalters gehört nicht der Zeiten an wo das deutsche Element die Herrschaft hatte, sie ist vorherrschend Romanische Natur." Ritter, as quoted by Milman). It was confined exclusively to the Latin language although under the impulse of Greek and

to some extent Arabic philosophy. It was never inward enough, however, for the real Germanic spirit. It was not congenial in its tone or method. It did not penetrate the soul, and reach the profound depths of life. It carried the dogma to the intellect, but did not enter the heart. More consonant to the German mind, on this side of its activity, was the process of mysticism, where the mind sinks back into itself, finding faith, not simply in an outward obedience to a system of dogma brought merely to thought and rendered intelligible in way of scientific statement, but finding faith in the life in whose mysterious depths God is operative, and the truth reveals itself. Mysticism, while in full obedience to the Church, was after all inwardly and in its whole process opposed to scholasticism, and yet scholasticism met with most unequivocal favor upon the part of Papacy. The '*Magister Sententiarum*' ruled the schools, and Thomas Aquinas was the canonized saint of Mediæval orthodoxy. Mysticism, however, did not satisfy the spirit which cultivated it. It rather served to open the way for that spirit to reach out to a position in which the absolute truth of divine revelation should really authenticate itself such in the sphere of human life, and bring reason and will into harmony with itself. In the movement towards such end, a continual opposition was awakened to mere externalism, to mere outward legalism, to arbitrary tradition, to everything which came to no real inward evidencing of itself; and in this, a tendency shows itself quite parallel with the political one to which we have referred, and over against which the Church continued the same external and formal authority. Political freedom and Christian liberty continually hovered before the Germanic world, and could not be reached, as we have said, either in State or Church as then constituted. The inevitable collision and open conflict came in the sixteenth century. Notwithstanding the broad and necessary issue, the Papacy strove to assert its authority as before and in the same arbitrary way, unwilling either to see its own abuse of power, or to show itself broad enough to meet the historical conditions of the age. The deep, earnest spirit of the Germanic world struggling for

ages, and now disciplined and cultured and penetrated by Christianity, rose up from within the Church itself in solemn protest, and sought the solution of the problem forced upon it by its own inward genius, and now made doubly important by its own Christian consciousness. It would have been treason to its own conscience and moral sense not to have done so. The Papacy, failing to reconcile the tendency with itself, and failing to conquer it in its progress, cast it off as something foreign to itself, and continues to show the same strange arbitrary judgment by calling its subsequent centuries of development the mere play of antichrist, or the vain opposition of heresy and schism. Notwithstanding its birth and growth within her own organism; notwithstanding the fact of its central import in modern civilization; notwithstanding the fact of its having taken up almost the whole progressive current of German national life into its own bosom, it is still refused to be regarded by the counter force which cast it off, as even mediating in any way a transition of the Church to some higher and more glorious (because more free) unity and authority. Such, however, we believe must be the final issue, the dawn of which as yet seems far below our horizon. No Christian conception of history can well maintain that a thousand years of development should only end in carrying entirely away from the mystery of the Holy Catholic Church the main historical force of that new Germanic world, which rose upon the ruins of the Roman empire with such glorious promise, under Christianity, of something higher and better. The character of this article does not allow us to trace the development beyond the Reformation, either of Protestantism or Roman Catholicism. Their continuance in history with such vital, and we may say, undiminished force, shows that some problem yet unsolved demands their activity. We dare not attempt to conjecture what ground in the end may be reached, where their present contrast and antithesis shall be reconciled. They must, however, pass through crises and struggles in history, before the absolute truth of Christianity shall in higher form of apprehension, comprehend them both in such integration of prin-

ciple as to answer at once their deepest meaning. Not by mutual abuse, neither by covering up with false charity the dangers and perversions of either, but by an earnest study of the peculiar historical meaning of both, and the mission involved in their continuance, and by a serious consciousness of Christ's continued presence in the Church and history, will the way be opened to realize the now hidden promise of the future.

There is one feature yet, which distinctly characterizes the Christian conception of history, and to which we have but casually referred, viz., the recognition of the presence and activity of Satan and his subordinates in the world. Satan is not viewed, in the light of Christianity, as simply the evil of the world generalized in thought, and then personated under this name. He is himself personal, possessed with intelligence and will, although self-perverted and in sin—a fallen one of the heavenly hierarchy. His activity, however, is not viewed as merely upon the world from without, but as in the world. *He* also, not of course, in the absolute form in which Christ does, enters history, incarnates himself as far as possible in its process, and in this way stands in mocking and active antagonism to Christ. Before the Incarnation, as we have said, the preexistent Logos was intimately related to the world. The world as created was a cosmos just because in the Logos it was related to a divine and rational idea of which through creation it became the utterance. Satan, therefore, reveals his activity primarily as *anticosmical,* striving to disintegrate the creation from its own law, striving to so disorganize it that its own movement might be self-destructive. Before man comes on to the stage of being, as the full integration of the antecedent process in self-consciousness and personality, Satan seems to have been present, and the "*tohu vah Ohohu*" of Genesis may be regarded as the result of his anticosmical activity. In the creation of man, a moral process was involved, in which willing God's will, man should go onward to the full positive completion of his life. Satan's activity now concentrates against man. Man was to replenish and subdue the earth. Satan strives to bring him under its subjection, and himself usurp the

lordship and become *prince of the world.* Man was to keep the garden. Satan strives to make him lose it. Man was to gather up the whole of nature in his own person, and bring it freely to the obedience of the divine will. Satan strives to break it upon man's self-determination, and gather the whole universe under his own dominion and make it servant to sin. The Logos became incarnate. Satan now as *antichrist* strives to incarnate himself in the human. He tempts Christ, sifts Peter, and enters Judas, the Apostle, and yet son of perdition. In history subsequent to the Incarnation, as the life of Christ continually unfolds itself, so Satan strives to incorporate himself with the process, and disintegrate it, reaching down continually into the human, until in the end he reveals himself as the *man of sin*, *i. e.*, until the human in its highest historical force under sin, becomes his own concentrated medium of destructive agency, his mock incarnation. Satan, thus entering into the sphere of history, cannot do so arbitrarily, however. There is, in the activity of every relative principle, what may be termed a side of temptation, and it is just here that he insinuates his presence. Man's characteristic was that of self-activity. In his consciousness there is a self-contained existence. But self-hood, though not by any means necessitating selfishness, has within it a possibility of it; and just here Satan becomes active to realize by seduction this bad possibility, and turn the highest creature back upon himself and away from God, in the very perversion of his noblest characteristic. So in history, in every tendency, however legitimate, there is involved the possibility of an inward perversion of itself. In Roman Catholicism, the principle of authority, itself of most necessary importance, has the possibility of showing itself mere arbitrariness, bold externalism, and tyranny in which the subjective is quite overwhelmed. The antichristian activity of Satan in this sphere will ever be characterized by bringing this possibility into full reality, that the authority may become immoral, and self-destructive. In Protestantism, the very principle of freedom, asserted with such necessary earnestness upon the side of the subjective, involves in itself the possibility of

sinking into mere individualism as regards organization and worship; mere independent rationalism as regards faith, and mere subjective feeling and false spiritualism over against the whole objective mystery of Grace. The antichristian activity of Satan will here reveal itself, by giving to this possibility its boldest actuality; and inasmuch as Protestantism is of such central historical force, and its principle of such fundamental import, its involved possibility of disguised antichristian activity is of the most serious and dangerous character, threatening the very perversion of the principle itself by carrying it into a process at every point self-destructive. It needs but little earnest observation to mark this perversion as now at work, especially in American Protestantism. The multiplication of sects, evincing a spirit whose irreverence for history is only equalled by its ostentatious reverence for self, and whose instinctive hostility to the whole idea of a supernatural constitution of grace as confronting men in the Church, shows at once its antichristian character; the persistent centering of worship upon inward and individual emotions, in the interest of what is termed *free prayer*, without any sense of a *divine presence* at the altar which is strangely regarded as bondage to mere form; the heroic effort to sink faith in the sphere of mere thinking and feeling, the lowest form of rationalism, cutting off the very organ for the supernatural from all connection with anything sacramental as opening in its presence the real contents of the heavenly world, and because forsooth the Sacraments may become only empty forms by being regarded as having contents of grace for faith; the pious exaltation of preaching the Gospel, placed in opposition and antithesis to baptism, as though the Holy Ghost in opening the way for the mystery, opened the way at the same time to dissipate that mystery itself, and as though trust might in some way be made to rest in vain ceremonies, when without the real presence of the Spirit in them, they ought to be discarded as empty and an unnecessary burden, not challenging faith, and only disquieting the pardoned soul; all this only shows how widely the perverting power is operative, and warns us to labor to unmask more

thoroughly the evil to bring it to judgment and condemnation.

In the end, all the bad possibilities of the world, as actualized through history and concentrated against Christ, reveal themselves in the *man of sin*, in Satan in his completest incarnation in a human personality, the highest form of created power. But, over-against this revelation, is the new creation in Christ, the God-man, infinitely more real and powerful, which under its exalted head shall be victorious in glory in that last great crisis and judgment, in which the first advent of Christ has at last developed through history into the second.

"Dies illa, dies vitae,
Dies lucis inauditae,
Qua nox omnis destruetur,
Et mors ipsa morietur!"

* * * * *

"Oh! beati tunc lugentes,
Et pro Christo patientes
Quibus *sæculi pressura*,
Regna dat semper mansura."

ART. V.—THE HISTORICAL ELEMENT IN THEOLOGY.

BY E. V. GERHART, D. D., PROFESSOR IN THE THEOL. SEMINARY, MERCERSBURG, PA.

All life is historical. The converse proposition is equally true. All history is a life movement, or an organic process.

An organic process is not governed by a power outside of itself, but it carries in its own bosom a law which determines its character—a law in virtue of which, the hidden fulness of life, which constitutes the relative beginning, comes forth in the way of genetic evolution, maintains itself with more or less steadiness against various hostile forces, and finally, after surmounting obstacles and passing through the successive stages answerable to the informing idea, attains to its end in a complete actualization, as to contents and form, of what was originally enveloped in the relative beginning.

The beginning is *relative*, because it supposes a more general life power in which it stands, and by which it is originated.

The evolution is a continued transition of being from one stage of life to another. The transition is not merely transformation, a change of manner or form of existence; nor is it the extinction of one type and law, and the introduction of another; but it is a change that is both inward and outward, constitutional and phenomenal; and yet through the entire transitional process there is no change at all. Determined by an immanent law that is alike necessary and unchangeable, the successive stages are only so many states and aspects of existence of one indestructible type, the rich nature of which is unfolded in the process.

The end of an organic process is identical with the beginning, the fruit with the seed; and yet in one view it is the opposite of it, and superior to it. The end is in the beginning, and the beginning is in the end; but not in the same sense. The end is in the beginning potentially; the beginning is in the end completely developed and actualized. Thus, whilst the two are the same, the end stands opposed to the beginning as the actual stands opposed to the possible; and it is superior to it as being the highest realization of the invisible type, and the most perfect revelation of the original intention.

Such an organic process, taking a broad view, is *history*. It is the new creating movement of organized life, or the spontaneous growth of a germinal principle; the ultimate aim being to realize the infinite contents of the germ through the medium of manifold forms of existence in perfect fruit. Fruit is the fulfilment of the promise given in the germ.

But the idea of history does not obtain with the same degree of propriety and fullness in all spheres of organic existence. Whilst we may predicate the historical even of the mineral kingdom, where the plastic powers of life are wanting altogether, inasmuch as the mineral enters into and conditions the intention and movement of the entire cosmical order, yet instead of history proper, we have in the kingdoms of organic nature standing below the human, no more than a beautiful but imperfect pre-

figuration of the truly historical—a movement that is indeed not external and mechanical, but internal and dynamic, yet one that turns upon and into itself, like the circumference of a circle, and never transcends but ever repeats, from age to age, the product of the first period. The history of the first generation of any species of animal is, essentially, the history of the last. There is no self-conscious, determinative power, but a blind necessity which carries the plant and the animal through an unmeaning and incomplete cycle; unmeaning, because their intention appears not in themselves, but in their concrete relation to what is higher; and incomplete, because the true nature of organic life is actualized only in humanity.

Here, now, there confronts us in man, the sphere of ethical existence, the true nature and purpose of mundane life, and therefore the true idea of that organic movement in which the distinctive character of history consists. Here there is a superior life, a life that is personal, and as such stands in the unity of conscious thought, free will and psychical feeling. Yet, as the human kingdom supposes, appropriates and comprehends all the essential forces which prevail in the inferior orders of existence, and as these forces condition, limit, and even mould the activity of the soul and spirit of man in his relation to all objects, natural and spiritual, we must distinguish manifold spheres of history in this higher region. These spheres of history are not co-ordinate; but they rise above and enter into each other organically. They are so joined together and compacted by that which each constituent element supplies, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, that humanity maketh increase of itself in the unity of its idea, until that idea informing the living process and wrought out in it, glorifies itself in the perfection of spirit. This glory, whether ever fully realized or not, is at least the divine intention which necessitates and ennobles the terrible convulsions, and seeming contradictions and failures which mark the history of our fallen race.

In the sphere of the human spirit, accordingly, we have an organic process also, just as we have in nature; but a process

that is intelligent and free, and for this reason a process that is in the proper sense *historical*. The life-movement is governed by an internal law, but it is the law of personal life. The law is active spontaneously, and anterior to self-conscious, ethical action; and it determines the nature of the movement as organic in distinction from mechanical, and concrete, in distinction from abstract. But the movement is in personality, in an order of life which, as to its essence, is the unity of thought and will; and is therefore mediated and conditioned, at all points, and in all its stages, by consciousness and the free activity of will. I must know myself in order to be myself truly. I must know the law of my personal life, in order that I may do the law, and thus realize the type of my being as human. On the other hand, it is equally true that I must will to be myself, in order to know myself; and I must do the law of my higher life, in order that I may know that law and the end of that law. There is no contradiction. For thought and will do not stand outside of each other, and hence cannot be said to come together. Thought and will are in each other. Though distinct, they are one in personality; just as the formative and materializing powers are one in the life principle of the plant. Each one both involves and conditions the other. Otherwise there can be no proper personal activity.

Now, it is just this living necessity determining the unity of thought and will, and requiring all consciousness to be free, and all moral action to be intelligent, which constitutes ethical law, or the law of personal life, and distinguishes it from natural law, or the law of the organic world lying below man.

From this view of the law of personal life, two things follow. The one is, that history, or the organic process in the sphere of spirit, is not abstract but concrete; the other, that history is not a circle, nor an endless repetition of circles, but it advances upon itself from age to age.

History is concrete. The human spirit does not stand apart from the human body, but being united to it, constitutes with it one organic whole. Possessing aptitudes that are infinite, and struggling towards an end that is transcendent and eternal,

man stands in a finite order and is active always, and can be active physically and ethically only, in time and space. Nor is man isolated from the material world. His life is inwoven with all living and lifeless existences belonging to nature. This relation of spirit to the natural, involves the natural in the organic movement of history. It comprehends not only systems and methods of thought, and the character of public sentiment, not only philosophy, science and the arts, but the social organism, the outward style of life, and the physical world. The process changes the face of the earth no less than the face of society; for these are only different sides of the same movement.

History is also essentially *progressive*. No age can perpetuate itself. What is peculiar and distinctive belongs to it alone, and as that period of life sinks into the past, making room for a new one, distinctive peculiarities sink into the past also, nor can they ever rise again in their original character. The attempt to hand down to posterity the social condition, or the method of thinking of any given period, is arbitrary; and the result a caricature, or a monstrosity. As well might one think of perpetuating a little child, or a young man, for half a century. A swelling bud cannot remain a bud; nor a blooming flower remain a flower. Even the central idea and the ruling tendency of an age, cannot hold their position as such, and continue to affirm their original relations. So long as a central idea or question continues to be central, the peculiar age holds sway. Not until the reigning ethical forces fulfil their mission, and thus come to a relative conclusion, can a new age dawn upon the world. Indeed, the very conception of an age, or period of history, implies that an old principle asserts its presence in a new form, or a new principle assumes controlling power.

Yet an age does not die and rot like a tree; neither its distinctive peculiarities, much less the central idea. One age is the basis and condition of another; and passes over into it, like the bud into the flower, and the flower into fruit. A succeeding age is only the life of the preceding one, advanced to another

stage of development. The mystery of human life, in one view, transcends itself; but, in another view, it carries itself in its own bosom.

What is phenomenal or particular, is transient; it is left behind and disappears. So, too, whatever performs an office which is, for the time, but the condition of the general process, falls away as being no longer necessary. But these are left behind only in a relative sense; like the first leaves of a stalk of wheat, or the rough, outside bark of an oak. A particular phenomenon performs its function, then ceases as such; but the formative influence which it exerts, is taken up into the process, and thus lives on through succeeding ages.

On the other hand, whatever is essential and general, belongs to the fullness of the principle, like the trunk of a tree, or the lungs and heart of the human body, and must, therefore, perpetuate itself; but it perpetuates itself organically, not mechanically. Even the central idea, the central tendency, cannot be handed down traditionally from one generation to another, much less from one period of history to another. Were this so, then history would simply repeat itself; like the animal kingdom in successive generations of the same genus. It would be a series of monotonous circles. But the central idea lives. It pervades, informs and controls the ethical life of humanity. This implies that the idea is continually re-wrought afresh. The informing, plastic power is spontaneous; but it involves, at every point, conscious reflection, and the free activity of the will. Thus, whilst the idea or tendency works, impels, energizes and fashions humanity according to its own law, and remains true to its general type, it is at the same time reproduced continually by the independent power of the human spirit, which, whilst conditioned by all its concrete relations to the natural world, is, nevertheless, always active according to its own intuitive forms of thought, and according to the self-lawgiving force of will. The spontaneous process being thus necessarily mediated by the free, independent power of man, the central idea changes and must change.

The change is not death. The ruling tendency is not sup-

planted and destroyed by a foreign power. The change is not exchange or substitution; but it is evolution, development, progress. It is such change as is comprehended in the evolution of life. Amid continual changes, the same general type and law are perpetuated.

Different from the first rude leaves of the sprouting acorn, which soon wither and perish, the original trunk of the oak lives on, it may be, through several centuries, the identical individual existence it was in the beginning. Yet it is not the same trunk. It is not the same in the sense in which a piece of parchment, or a watch, may be precisely the same thing from year to year. What the trunk was, it is not now; what it is now, it will not be hereafter; what it is to be and will be, it is not and never has been. It changes not only as to size, shape, weight and external appearance, but also as to life and constitution. The life is more vigorous and more complete, and the constitution, if the process be normal, acquires qualities and aptitudes which it did not possess before, or the same qualities and aptitudes appear in different measure and form. So great and manifold is the change wrought in the course of a hundred years, that it exceeds the power of definite description. Yet this particular oak continues to be the same tree; the same as to genus and species; the same also as to individual existence. The last stage of evolution in the life of an oak, is only the full reality of what was potential in the germ of an acorn.

This is a natural mystery; the mystery of life. The understanding cannot analyze it. It confronts the eye of the reason. We gain an apprehension of it by the intuitive power of comprehension and insight; not by any inductive or deductive process.

It is in this genetic sense that history is progressive, and transcends itself continually. The ethical life of humanity, is reaching out and struggling after something which it is not; it is unceasingly becoming what it is not and never has been; and it will attain to a position scientifically, in regard to philosophy and theology; and will acquire a character ethically, which it does not and never did possess, which it never could possess

before, and cannot possess now. Opinions and theories, and methods of thought prevail for a season, perform their work, and fulfil their mission. In the degree in which they fulfil their mission, they originate or give occasion for the origination of modified forms of themselves; and as they occasion modifications of themselves, they exhaust their own vitality, lose their relative position and controlling influence, and resolve themselves into that form of general consciousness, and into that moral attitude of humanity, which comes after them and transcends them. In their original character, they cease to exist. Like leaves near the root, these opinions, theories, systems and forms of dogma, dry up and fall off. But having been a part of the general ethical process, they stand in an internal, living relation to the constitution of humanity; and in virtue of the law of development, they are taken up, transformed and converted into the flesh and blood of ethical life, as realized in the succeeding period of history. Thus, the self-evolving, general life of humanity, ever changing, yet always identical, moves forward towards a higher end, and in each succeeding age realizes a form of character which is new. And so the mysterious process will continue to go forward, ever advancing beyond itself from age to age, until all the possibilities of the beginning have passed into full reality.

This mysterious life-process in the sphere of the human spirit, is not purely human. It is not self-sufficient. It has not its ultimate ground in itself. Nor is it normal. It does not go forward in true accord with the original law of humanity, nor is the relative actualization, at any stage, answerable to the original idea.

History is the sum of three factors—the divine, the human and the diabolical; God, man, and the Devil. Of these three, two, the divine and the human, are original, essential and eternal. The diabolical is not original, but has supervened by a violent infraction upon the cosmical order, and the constitution of man. It is not essential, but accidental and abnormal. Nor is it eternal, but only temporary. History admitted this foreign force after it had been constituted; and history will also, in due time, surmount all the consequent disorder and confusion.

The divine factor in history is two-fold. On the one hand, it is the action of God in and upon mankind according to that original order of life as it held in Adam, the head of the race, before the fall. Man was the son of God, and like God. In all his powers and relations he was active in harmony with the will and being of God. He ruled in and over the world. He was its lord. Though now fallen and debased, yet his spirit retains a sense and a dream-like intuition of this primary filial relation. The Creator is present in creation, upholding and governing all things by the word of His Almighty power. Of this fact man has by nature an unerring instinct, and this instinct obtains authoritative expression in the conscience. Man feels and recognizes both the presence and power, and the direct action of God.

The divine factor in history, on the other hand, is the activity of God in and upon mankind according to the new and higher order of life as it holds in Jesus Christ, the incarnate Logos, the Head of a new created human race—a new order which in and through this new humanity reaches beyond the human and, apprehending nature, affects it in such sort that it is made to subserve the end of the incarnation.

The divine factor, though two-fold, is yet but one. The new creation in Christ is generically different from the first creation in Adam, yet as to their ground and ultimate purpose, they are the same. The law which informs the constitution and governs the life of the one, corresponds to the law which informs the constitution and governs the life of the other. The first creation demands the incoming of the second creation; and the second completes the idea and nature of the first. Though different in function and kind, yet nature and grace are hemispherical orders which together make one divine world; the direct action and governing power of God upon the lower, being subordinate to the end of the higher; and the special action of God through His Son by the Holy Ghost in the development and perfection of the higher, revealing and fulfilling the true intention of the lower. The final consummation of the Church

will be the full glory of the whole of God's creating and governing activity.

The divine is the original and principal factor; we may also call it the determining factor of history. But the divine does not overwhelm the human, nor violate the freedom of the human. The activity of man is put forth according to his own nature and will.

The diabolical factor of history is present and active in the character of sin. Sin is the disturbing, divisive, disorganizing and disintegrating force, which like a deadly poison permeates the very blood of human life and circulates as a vitiating principle in all the arteries and veins of the soul, everywhere and always contravening all law and order, both human and divine.

The relation of sin to man is two-fold. Sin bears a relation to man as comprehended in the first creation; and it bears a relation to man as comprehended in the new creation in Christ. The temptation of the devil having prevailed, he became through the fall the god of man. Led captive at his will, the fallen world belongs to his kingdom, obeys his will, and worships him, either directly or indirectly. Sin is the governing power. Human freedom is no more than a vain show, in as much as, although the form of self-determining will still remains, the will is wanting altogether in the true substance of freedom. History is like a raving maniac. The human spirit, instinct with the sense of terrible contradiction between its nobler aspirations and the miseries of actual existence, writhes in agony, and struggles to free itself from violent bondage, but with each spasmodic effort falls back again helplessly under the augmented burden of sin. Yet athwart this deep gloom some broken rays from the true Light ever fall, inspiring the bond slaves of Satan with the faint hope of deliverance; and amid these awful perversions and horrors, the eye of Christian faith sees the wisdom and power of God so shaping and guiding the agony of the ages that the captive human spirit is gradually preparing for the dawn of the new creation.

The new creation is a victory over the devil and all the powers of darkness. Christ has led captivity captive. The devil

and sin now stand in a new subordinate relation to Christ and to His body, the Chur ch. They still possess power, and produce all manner of evils in the world and in the bosom of the Church; for Christianity apprehends fallen human nature as it is, and takes it into the sphere of the new life with all its corrupt and sinful tendencies. Regenerated by the Spirit, men do indeed possess a new life, and their slavish subjection to sin is supplanted by true liberty; yet salvation is not perfect; they are not saved magically, but in accordance with the original law of their constitution; salvation is a *process* of deliverance. Hence though limited and restrained, Satan still continues to exercise power both in the world and upon the kingdom of Christ; and history, moulded and governed by Christianity, is in consequence more or less irregular, self-contradictory and abnormal. As the growth of the natural body is modified, checked or suspended by unfavorable climate and disease; so is the general ethical life of the world, in the effort to develop itself normally, limited, perverted, falsified, and sometimes temporarily suspended by the superhuman power of the devil.

These two classes of powers, on the one hand, the divine and human as being normal, essential, and harmonious, and on the other, the diabolical, as being abnormal, accidental and antagonistic, enter into the nature of history. The divine and human powers are in the proper sense factors, since they are each a necessary, plastic force, and a constituent element of the organic process of ethical development. The diabolical power being heterogeneous and having supervened in violation of the divine law and purpose of humanity, is in no sense an essential constituent of history; but as it has insinuated itself in the form of sin, into the very heart of mankind and corrupted its life-blood, it perverts the activity of the spirit, and thus exerts throughout all the ages of time a determining influence, from within, as it does also from without, upon the course and actual character of history.

These three powers: first, the presence and action of the divine in the world but particularly in the Church; secondly, the activity of the human in its relation to itself, and in its relation

to the two kingdoms, the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of Satan; and thirdly, the positive antagonism to God and man of Satan in nature and in humanity; these three, each one according to its own order, are working in the life of the race, determining and conditioning the historical movement from the beginning to the end. The mysterious phenomena of history are the result of the interaction of these forces.

As history comprehends the entire activity of man, it is evident that it must be an element in every sphere in civilization and government, in religion, science, art and morality.

We will limit the further discussion of the subject to the relation which the historical element bears to theology.

Christian theology is the science of the heavenly cosmos, the new creation of God in Christ Jesus. The object of the science, that with which theology deals, is a divine constitution, and as such is neither determined nor affected by logical reflection. But the science itself, like philosophy in general and all the sciences, is human, not divine. It is the production of the human reason, which, moved by its own deepest needs seeks spontaneously to develop and articulate the contents of Christian faith according to the categories and laws of thought. Being science, a rational production, it is subject to the general conditions to which any other science is subject.

Theology has not been revealed. The scientific knowledge of God is not a part of revelation. God teaches no doctrinal system; neither in His Word nor anywhere else. Christ is not a professor of theology. The Scriptures do not contain science. We find in them no logical organization of thought. The different parts are internally connected, but not logically; they are connected according to the laws of organic evolution; and are therefore more nearly allied to the nature of a living constitution than to that of a logical system. The sacred Scriptures are not properly a concrete order. They are rather a true reflection of that concrete historical movement in which Christianity consists; and are handed down in the Church as the original and ultimate medium through which, if

we possess their spirit, we can investigate the objective truth, and construct a system of theological knowledge.

Theology is primarily knowledge, such knowledge as man, in the light and strength of faith, acquires by the exercise of his own mental faculties. It is not a quantum of information given to man by God, which he is to receive and keep, as a son may receive money from his father. In this way we do not acquire any kind of knowledge, much less the knowledge of God. But we get the knowledge of God just as we get all other knowledge, namely, by the application of our minds in the ordinary way to the study of the truth. For the knowledge of divine things differs from the knowledge of human things, not as regards form and method, but as regards the object and material. Hence whatever affects the activity of the mind, modifies thought and knowledge, and therefore also the knowledge of divine things, such as natural capacity, temperament, health, education, culture, the prevailing type of morality, social habits, government and climate. All these condition theology, as it obtains in an age in a community, or school, or in an individual.

It is not sufficient, however, to say that theology is knowledge. It is more than this. Theology is the scientific or systematic knowledge of divine things. System is the logical form of thought. Science includes system; but it is more than mere system. Science is the logical organization of the contents of an idea; or we may say that it develops and organizes the intuitive apprehension of objective truth. This involves the free activity and the most comprehensive activity of the human reason. Intuition, generic forms of thought, the spontaneous operation of the laws of thought, judgment, reflection and what is more important still, the will and the conscience, all interpenetrate each other organically in the process of rational activity which constructs scientific knowledge; and, consequently, these attributes of the human reason serve to give character of necessity to the state and progress of science.

But lying back of these particular functions of the reason, there is a determination that is deeper and broader. It is an

object of intuitive perception rather than of judgment and reflection; and is felt more easily than defined. This mystical background of science is the idea prevailing in the general mind, in regard to the general nature of things, their reciprocal relations and purpose, affecting particular departments of thought as the season of the year affects vegetation, the habits of animals, and the customs of society. This prevailing idea manifests itself in a general method of thinking, which suggests opinions, directs investigations and shapes theories; as also in a felt presence of a hidden standard of truth to which theories are instinctively referred, and by which moral conduct is adjudged right or wrong. Here in these deep recesses of humanity tendencies are conceived and born unseen, and nourished long before they come forth into the light of day. And here in this bosom of mysterious human powers is continually going forward the most virulent conflict between good and evil, truth and falsehood, Christ and the devil.

Now, whilst very much depends, as regards the state of theological science at any given time, on mental vigor, education, civilization, on the prevailing system of philosophy, and the progress of the sciences, much more depends on this current tendency and habit of mind, on the manner in which the age thinks, or any particular school or community thinks. For the prevailing tendency and method of thought imparts a common character, even to opposite systems of theology. If the predominant tendency be subjective and abstract, then opposite systems and different denominations will be alike in this, that they resolve Christianity into a peculiar religious state and activity of the human spirit, and are always predisposed to view a fact, an element, or a law, independently of the internal relation which it bears to the unity of which it is a necessary part. Whereas, if the prevailing method of thinking be objective and concrete, systems may differ as to Church polity, or the doctrine of the Sacraments, or the relation which objective authority bears to subjective freedom; but they will be alike in this, that however they may differ as respects particular dogmas, they regard Christianity, primarily, as a living constitution, more

real than the constitution of nature, and view facts, elements and laws, as necessary parts of the organic order to which they belong. So, too, if the general habit of mind be analytic, or synthetic, or genetic.

This general habit and tendency of thought, this underlying assumption, as regards the nature and relations of things, is the principal mediating power and condition of theological science. Genius, national culture, and the predominant system of philosophy, each one exercises an important modifying influence, but these are born of the age, and nourished at its bosom. To these, the prevailing general tendency of the age gives tone and coloring. Individual men are its organs, and particular theories its varying exponents. It is in and through them that the prevailing tendency mediates the character and progress of theology. Theology does not rise above it, and cannot. If the general habit be analytic and inductive, theology will endeavor to construct a system by analysis and induction. If the general habit be metaphysical and deductive, theology will move in the element of demonstration.

It cannot be otherwise, in the nature of the case. Knowledge and science are the product of human activity. No power outside of man can put knowledge, much less science, into him. God does not. God creates; He brings man into being, but in doing so He establishes a constitution that actualizes His idea, and embodies His will as inviolable law. The original, human constitution is the concrete decree of God. God may also regenerate. He creates anew in Christ by His spirit, and thus translates men into a heavenly world, setting them in new relations and endowing them with new powers. Standing in either order, it is the primary vocation of man to become self-conscious and self-active according to the law of his life. In the light of consciousness and by the activity of his own powers, he is to acquire knowledge and construct science. For this very purpose, that he may think and act for himself, was man made man, endowed with reason and will, and raised infinitely above the animal. Now, it is according to this law of his constitution, that God deals with him. To say that God may breathe into

him knowledge and science, and, superseding mental activity, may lift him out of the concrete relations of life, by an act of omnipotent power, is to say that God may annul His own idea and law, and thus contradict Himself.

If, then, man must acquire theological knowledge by his own personal act, by the proper exercise of reason and will, and if his rational activity is conditioned by the underlying, general tendency of the age, or the reactionary tendency in which he may stand, or by both, it follows that theology is conditioned not only by the peculiar characteristics of his mind, and the system of philosophy by which he is apprehended, but also by that deep and mighty tide of rational life which carries him upon its bosom. Theology appropriates and assimilates to itself these conditioning forces. They become an element in its character, and are an essential factor in the determination of its status at any given time.

Hence, theology rises and sinks, advances and recedes, diverges into false currents and returns to the main channel, with the general ethical movement of humanity. It sympathizes with the valid progress of history; also with all its contradictions, convulsions and conflicts. These modifications and changes, however, are not a wild, unmeaning and fitful play of disconnected and irresponsible powers, but they are comprehended in that continuous organic process. which belongs to the divine idea of human life. Over this process Christ rules, and in it He works towards a specific end; namely, the complete development of the objective truth in human consciousness, and the perfection of His body, the Church.

Of the nature of this organic process going on in the sphere of theological science, the past history of the Church affords a sufficient and forcible illustration; but time does not allow us to dwell on this aspect of the subject.

The historical element inheres in all science. Every department of scientific knowledge is continually changing and moving forward according to the law of life. But this element belongs to theology, and characterizes it in a pre-eminent sense; and for the reason that the objective truth which theology aims at

reproducing scientifically, is itself historical. Christianity is the most comprehensive and most perfect life-movement in the sphere of time. The Logos being its original ground, which accordingly stands above and beyond time, it begins in the promise concerning Himself, made to the mother of the race. The promise being thus coeval with human development, becomes the divine principle of a concrete, preparatory process, a preliminary constitution, which unfolds itself in successive stages, each one in turn transcending the measure of what goes before, yet at the same time bearing in itself, under a higher form, the mysterious intention of all preceding stages, until the fullness of time having come, this unique, symbolical constitution comes to maturity in the mystery of the incarnation, and then passes away, the purpose of its existence having been fulfilled in the personal presence of the Logos, the Son of the Virgin Mary.

The Logos was made flesh. He took human nature into life-union with Himself, not in appearance, nor magically, but really and truly; that is, in the act of becoming incarnate. He laid aside the transcendent form of divine existence, and began to exist in time and space, conformably to the law of organic development. From His miraculous conception by the Holy Ghost to His ascension, there is a regular unfolding of a divine-human life. One stage of life follows upon another naturally. So does one act of His redeeming work follow another naturally. And just as the natural process advances normally, does the fact of the incarnation authenticate itself as real, and reveal gradually more and more of its mysterious import and purpose.

Objectively considered, this is Christianity, this organic process developing the fullness of divine-human life under all the conditions of time and space, whereby human nature in Christ is united to God, by the new creating power of the Holy Ghost, and so regenerated and delivered from all the power of the Devil.

But this organic process has not yet reached its final stage, and assumed its ultimate form. Christianity is incomplete, as really, though in a different degree, as when Christ was a babe.

We believe not only in Christ conceived and born, crucified, risen and ascended; we believe also in Christ coming to judge the quick and the dead; we believe in the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting. These are future facts, and just as essential to the integrity and proper character of Christianity, as the death of Christ on the cross. Manhood abolishes boyhood: so does the flower abolish the bud, and the fruit, the flower. In like manner, does Christianity, being a living constitution, undergo organic changes. The last stage, when developed, will abolish preceding forms of existence; not destroy them, but fulfil them; just as ripe fruit transcends, abolishes and, at the same time, fulfils the bud. Fruit actualizes the idea and purpose of all that goes before. So will the final consummation, in the second Advent of Christ, reveal to faith the full import of the entire process of His divine-human life in time.

Christianity, coeval with the birth of time, unfolding itself in two dispensations and throughout all the ages, and going beyond the time-order of things, is therefore an organic process, which realizes the nature and law of history in a sense and degree that in no other form confronts the human reason.

Answerable to this objective historical order, of which Christ is the principle and the consummation, is the subjective development of faith and knowledge in the consciousness of prophets and Apostles. Simple faith in Jesus of Nazareth as the promised Messiah, without any right conception of His person, grew gradually in the minds of the disciples into the perception of a supernatural presence, until Peter, speaking in the name of the Twelve, gave utterance to a higher apprehension in that wonderful primal confession: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." But this true confession co-existed with erroneous views and great ignorance of the nature of His work. Though clearly foretold by Christ Himself, yet the disciples were incapable even of entertaining the idea of His propitiatory death and triumphant resurrection. So foreign was the necessity of His crucifixion and resurrection to all their views and expectations, that His condemnation by Pilate and execution as a

malefactor, filled them with despair; and the first report of His resurrection seemed like an idle tale. Not until they had received the Pentecostal baptism of the Holy Ghost, did these select scholars of Christ emerge into the light of day. Yet even then, though inspired miraculously, their knowledge of the kingdom was at first imperfect and defective, and their judgment crude. A miraculous vision was necessary in order to prevail on Peter, this bold, confessing representative of the Apostolic College, to preach the Gospel to Cornelius and other Gentiles. So deep-rooted were his narrow Jewish prejudices. And for obeying the heavenly vision, it was necessary to vindicate his conduct at length, in order not to fall under the condemnation of his peers. Thus, only by a gradual process, moving in a natural way and extending through many years, did these men, enjoying the highest degree of inspiration, transcend their narrow conceptions and false notions, and finally come to a distinct and full apprehension of the truth.

The same general feature characterizes Holy Scripture. The first three Gospels, by general acknowledgment, move on a lower plane than the Gospel of St. John, which was written last and by that one of the disciples who stood at the Cross. If we study the Epistles of St. Paul in the order of time in which they were written, we can scarcely fail to observe the natural process of growth in the mind of the Apostle, under tuition of the Spirit, in the knowledge of the Person of Christ and His kingdom. The Book of Revelation, written last, deals with the last things. Writing in his old age, the surviving Apostle, after administering final instructions and counsels to the churches in Asia Minor, looks beyond the present time; and, his eagle eye penetrating the vista of the future, he portrays in symbolic imagery the conflicts, the triumphs and the full ultimate glory of the one Holy Catholic Church. The last book, written by the last Apostle, rises thus above all previous apprehension, and reveals the final consummation of the mysterious historical movement of the supernatural under the law of the natural, which begins with the beginning of time, and, unfolding itself organically through all the ages, closes the whole process by resolving it into the transcendent order of glorified life.

Here, then, we have in objective Christianity a living process which is the most sublime and the most perfect historical movement; we have a corresponding process in the growing faith and consciousness of inspired Apostles and Evangelists; and we have in the organic constitution of the sacred canon, a definite reflection of both sides of the historical development. Confronted by this new and wonderful order of divine-human life in the form of history, the human reason, in the unceasing effort to evolve scientifically the contents of faith, stands continually under an objective moulding influence, that gives impulse to, energises and sustains, a corresponding organic process in the sphere of logical thought, which in the highest possible degree realizes the historical element. The organic law of mind; the spontaneous tendency of human thinking continually to transcend itself and reach forward to what lies beyond, finds its fullest scope in theological science. The movement will go forward necessarily in time to come, until Christianity itself becomes complete, when theological science will bear its ripest fruit.

The historical element in theology is related on the one hand to Creed, and on the other to Confessions. The limits of a discourse, however, confine this discussion to a general view of the subject, and forbid us to enter into an examination of the particular questions which it involves.

We conclude with a brief statement of a few inferences which follow from the whole subject.

No particular status of theological science can be fixed and permanent. Theology may pass through a period of earnest, vigorous thought, and attain to results which are an advance upon the whole previous consciousness of the Church, and may be a relative completion of the science as it stood before, yet this position of theology is not unchangeable because it is such an advance and relative completion. Just the reverse. An advanced status of theology is the product of living thought, and it is true and valuable only as long as it stands in connection with living thought. So soon as living thought ceases, or exhausts itself, or dies, theological ideas must die too. When

a tree dies, the fruit must wither, and the leaves fall off. Then the theological status becomes a dead form of knowledge, and loses all power to nourish mind and thought. But if living thought continues to be living, it is also productive. Any given result carries in itself the necessity of further development. It is like a flower that must die or pass over into fruit; or like fruit that embosoms the seed which carries in itself the power, type and law of a new growth. If the embosomed seed does not become productive, it is for one of two reasons; either the seed has no life, or the living seed is not surrounded with the proper conditions. So in regard to the progress of theology. The legitimate product of any age of vigorous thought, is itself productive. If not productive, either it is dead and therefore worthless, or there is no fertility in the mind of the Church, sufficient to carry forward the productive process. But if the ideas be legitimate and the doctrines be true, they possess living force, and therefore do work and must work organically in the thinking of the Church. Hence a true doctrinal position, in as far as it is true, is a power that works, according to historical law, towards a result that lies beyond itself, and in which it finds a higher relative completeness. No particular doctrinal position can therefore, in the nature of the case, be a fixed position, which is to stand as the ultimatum of truth for all subsequent ages.

We do not wish to be understood, however, as implying that the objective truth itself undergoes changes, excepting such organic changes as are determined by the law of its own divine-human constitution. What Christianity is in itself as the new creation in Christ Jesus, it is independently of human judgment and human will. It unfolds itself and moves, through successive stages, towards ultimate consummation according to the law of its own life. This new creation is the object of faith, and in itself is unaffected by the progress of theology. But dogmas are not divine; they are human. Dogma is the definite form of apprehension by the regenerated human reason, of the objective facts of Christianity. Dogma is therefore mediated by thought, and though conditioned by the presence and overruling

power of Christ by the Spirit, it must undergo modifications answerable to the general historical movement of human life.

From what has now been said it follows, also, that *the doctrinal position of any past age, cannot be made by itself the standard of sound doctrine for all future time, by a deliberate purpose of the Church.* The Church of the Reformation, whether Reformed or Lutheran, cannot repristinate the precise form of faith and worship that prevailed in the sixteenth century. Nor can the Church of England repristinate the peculiar type of Christian life which prevailed in the age preceding the rise of the Roman Catholic Papacy. The deliberate purpose is itself a change, a new position. The Reformation, for instance, did not refer itself to itself, and affirm, or imply, that its doctrinal position and cultus were the final rule and measure of truth to the end of coming ages. On the contrary, the faith of the Reformation rooted itself, in the way of most solemn Confession, in the Apostle's Creed, the faith of the Church Catholic through all past time; and the theological system of that period did not claim to be a new and independent creation but sustained itself by reference to the better results of theological thought as these appear in every period of history back to the Apostolic period; and by the aid of this whole process of thought it studied Holy Scripture. Now, to ignore or set aside the historical connection of the faith and theology of the Reformation with preceding ages, and make the precise theological expression of faith of that time the law of inquiry and living thought, and the limit of theological knowledge, is not only arbitrary and mechanical, but is also, in spite of the effort to establish a given position permanently, a radical change of position, perverting and contradicting the theological status which we profess to honor. For the theology of the Reformation claimed to be no more than a purer and fuller development, and a better articulation of the revealed truth taught and believed in all previous periods of Church history.

We may add also that the past is in a certain sense buried. It may be buried by violence or in a legitimate way. The past can be revived, but it cannot be exhumed. To exhume the

past, ignoring the intervening thinking and progress of the Church, is to bring up a corpse. But to revive the buried past is to quicken anew its own proper life, and unfold it freely, and according to the present demands of faith and thought.

The Heidelberg Catechism was buried during the last century by the violence of rationalism and infidelity. The present theological movement of the Church, has restored this noble symbol of the Reformed faith to authority and honor. But it has not restored to honor a dead thing; but breathed into it afresh the breath of a vigorous life. The Christocentric faith and organic thought of the Catechism, has been developed and is in process of being wrought out conformably to the original posture and reigning spirit of the Catechism.

The present position which the Reformed Church in America has come to occupy historically, is the very position which distinguishes the Heidelberg Catechism. By its very structure it connects itself internally with the universal faith of the Church. The Apostle's Creed is the law, the internal formative force, which negatively and positively determines the organization of its parts, and governs the expression of doctrine. Thus it connects itself directly with every previous age of the Church, and honors the authority of every previous age.

On the other hand, in modifying the doctrinal expression of faith, it claims the right to think for itself—the right to make due account of history. It acknowledges and emphasizes the historical element in theological science. The Catechism claims to be a progressive movement. It claims and exercises the right to work out such changes in doctrine as are a true and legitimate unfolding of the unchangeable faith.

This general position of the Catechism is the general position which the Reformed Church of the present day is earnestly seeking to occupy. The Church receives the confessional system of the Heidelberg Catechism as being in harmony with the Bible; and owns its doctrines as flowing from the Bible in the sense of the Creed. But the Church does not convert the Catechism into a Procrustean bed, and forbid theological thinking and theological teaching to transcend these iron limits.

Whilst the Catechism is true and possesses binding authority for faith and teaching, it is not held to be in all its particulars the final perfection of theology. The Church feels itself to be free as well as bound—free to think, as well as bound to believe —free to think historically, as well as bound to submit in child-like simplicity to the faith of the Church as held in all ages of the world.

ARTICLE VI.—ORIGIN AND STRUCTURE OF THE APOSTLES' CREED.

BY J. W. NEVIN, D.D., LANCASTER, PA.

THE title it bears does not mean that the symbol, as we now have it, was the work originally of the Apostles themselves. It has been indeed a very widely prevalent opinion in the Church, resting in long tradition, that it originated in this way. Rufinus, a church father of the fourth century, speaks of it as a common belief in that age, handed down from earlier times, that the Apostles, before separating to their different fields of labor, met together in Jerusalem, and under the guidance of the Holy Ghost framed and adopted this compend, to be received by the infant churches everywhere as a common bond of faith. The term *symbol* was supposed to favor, as it probably at first suggested, this imagination, by indicating in its Greek etymology a joint composition made up of different parts contributed from different quarters; in conformity with which view then it was sometimes held also, that each Apostle had contributed separately a distinct article or clause to the work which was thus brought to pass. But this whole opinion is easily shown to be false. No such Apostolic rule is spoken of in the New Testament. None of the church fathers before Rufinus, Greek or Latin, make any mention of the tradition to which he refers; and in all their controversies and discus-

sions, we meet with no appeal whatever to any such single fixed form of words, as of established authority from the time of the Apostles. On the contrary, the way in which they express themselves in regard to the subject, shows clearly that no fixed form of this sort was in existence. They refer frequently to a Christian rule or canon of faith, and occasionally give us the sum of its contents; but this always with such free variation, as plainly implies that the rule was regarded as standing in the substance of what it taught, rather than in any particular form of expression. Nay, the testimony of Rufinus himself is conclusive in regard to this point. He affirms expressly, that the form was not the same precisely in all the churches; additions were made to it in some cases, in opposition to particular new phases of heresy. What the title of the symbol means then is, not that it was composed by the Apostles, but that it contains, in a form universally approved by the Church, the sum and substance of what the Apostles taught, the fundamental rule and normative scheme of the Christian faith, as this had been established by them and handed down from the beginning.

The conception of such a normative scheme does not require continued sameness of words for its representation, but only sameness of substance and fact. Even the tradition mentioned by Rufinus, which in the fourth century referred the authorship of the creed to the Apostles, must be taken to have understood this more of its substantive matter than of the precise form of words in which it was uttered. For Rufinus does not pretend to restrict this honor to any one form of the general creed then in use; but takes it for granted rather, that all the churches enjoyed in this respect the same advantage, as being alike in possession of the faith received from the Apostles. No difficulty was felt among the churches in recognizing the identity of their faith, through all the variations that were allowed in the form of its expression. It was known, that the general symbol admitted an utterance more or less free, as circumstances might require; that particular clauses had been brought into it with the progress of time, which did not belong

to it in the beginning; and that it was not the same precisely at all points, in any two leading provinces of the Church. And yet it was felt none the less surely for all this, that the Church had but one creed, and that this was of truly Apostolical origin and force. Its unity stood in its substance. Its stability was not in the outward letter, so much as in the inward spirit. It was written and preserved, as Jerome tells us, not on parchment, but on the fleshy tables of the heart.

We may easily see in this way, how the symbol, as we now have it, may be said to refer itself back, through all its early changes and variations, to the very age of the Apostles, and to carry in itself as derived immediately from them what was the one unvarying faith of the Church in following ages. It lies in the nature of the case, that the Christian profession must have involved some common rule of faith from the beginning; and we know from the New Testament, that this stood in the acknowledgment of the mystery of the Incarnation, the coming of Christ in the flesh. Christianity roots itself, both as doctrine and life, in that fact. Peter's memorable confession (Matt. xvi. 16. John vi. 68, 69), becomes thus the germ or principle of all right confessional belief: carrying in itself, we may say, the universal truth and power of the Gospel. The form of baptism, as prescribed by our Saviour Himself, is only an enlarged utterance of the same faith. The Holy Trinity is revealed only in and through Christ; to confess Him, is to confess at the same time the Father and the Holy Ghost; and this threefold confession gives us at once the outline and scheme of the entire creed. How far it may have become usual, before the death of the Apostles, to take into the scheme formally, the secondary clauses of the confession as it now stands, cannot be clearly determined. But no one familiar with the early history of Christianity can well fail to see, that this must have been done at least to some considerable extent; and there isgood reason to believe, that early in the second century, if not before, nearly all the particulars now embraced in it were found more or less in current use.

Still, as already said, this current use remained irregular

and free. There was one creed, but various forms of giving it utterance. These variations were not felt to trench at all upon the unity of the general tradition or rule; and this is frequently appealed to accordingly, by the early writers, as being of acknowledged and easily intelligible authority. Irenæus speaks of such an "immovable rule of faith," and describes it as proclaiming the same particulars that are found in the later creeds; and he makes it to be, at the same time, of Apostolical and universal authority; a tradition handed down from the Apostles and their disciples, which was kept sacredly by the Church diffused throughout the whole world. "The dialects in which it is uttered," he says, "are different; but the tradition is in force the same. The churches founded in Germany have no other faith and doctrine; nor those in Spain; nor those among the Celts; nor those in the East; nor those in Egypt; nor those in Lybia; nor those of more central situation; but as the sun, God's workmanship, is over the whole globe one and the same, so also the evangelical truth shines everywhere and illuminates all who are willing to come to its light." Tertullian appeals frequently in the same free way, to the Christian rule of faith, and recapitulates several times its general contents, always in harmony with the sum of it as given by Irenæus, for the purpose of confuting and confounding the heretics of his own time. His recapitulations are indeed always different, sometimes more and sometimes less full, showing that the creed was life more than mere word; but they assume throughout, nevertheless, the clear identity belonging to it as a single apostolical tradition. "Regula fidei," he tells us, "uno omnino est, sola immobilis et irreformabilis." The amount of it is always: One God, the Almighty Maker of the world; His Son, Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, constituted Messiah, crucified under Pontius Pilate, raised the third day, exalted to heaven, and set at the right hand of God, from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead; the Holy Ghost sent forth vicariously, according to His promise, to sanctify those that believe in his name; the resurrection of the flesh, the damnation of the wicked, and the recep-

tion of the righteous into eternal life and the blessedness of heaven. This rule, he says, instituted by Christ, allows no questions, other than such as spring from heresy and go to make heretics; it is older than all heresies; their novelty, as exposed by it, serves to establish its antiquity; to know nothing beyond it, is to know all that is necessary. Origen, in like manner gives a summary statement of the heads of Christian doctrine, "as plainly received by apostolical tradition," which corresponds in substance with the same rule. From Cyprian again we learn, that the whole creed, nearly as we have it now was made use of in Africa, in his time, as a rule of faith derived from the Apostles, in connection with the service of baptism. These private testimonies show the presence everywhere in the early Church of an evangelical tradition, agreeing in its general contents with the creed as it now stands, and accepted as of strictly apostolic origin and weight. They show also, that this tradition, though always of the same general type, was not regarded as a slavish form of words, but as a free doctrine rather which might be uttered in various ways. Cyprian gives us a glimpse into the general African formula, as it was everywhere of force in the first part of the third century. Other sections of the Church had similar standing forms; some more full perhaps than others; those of the East different from those of the West; but all handed down from the earliest time, and palpably expressing one and the same faith, as they belonged also to one and the same baptism. In the fourth century, these public formularies come more distinctly into view; and now it was that a sort of central dignity and preëminence, among the symbols of the Western Church, began to be claimed and allowed in favor of the form which had long been in use at Rome. Gradually this authority became more and more widely established; other local and provincial forms fell quietly into neglect; until finally the Roman symbol, in the fifth and sixth centuries, worked its way into universal use; and has thus come down to us, with the veneration of the whole Christian world, as the standard version or edition of the ancient rule of faith, the best and truest

representation of the fundamental realities of the Christian religion, the proper "Apostles' Creed."

Thus it is that this form of sound words lies at the foundation of Christianity in all centuries and through all times. No confessionalism can be truly Christian, which does not start from this confession as its original root and source. Here, as on a common basis, all Churches rest, whether Oriental or Western, Roman Catholic or Protestant. The object of the Reformation was to remove the rubbish which threatened to smother the life of the ancient faith, not by any means to set aside this faith itself. Both divisions of the Protestant Church, accordingly, the Lutheran and the Reformed, joined in acknowledging the ancient œcumenical symbols, and especially the root of all symbols as found in the Apostles' Creed. In the Lutheran Church, the three primary Creeds (Apostolical, Nicene and Athanasian) are made to precede the Augsburg Confession, in the Form of Concord; to show, says Walch, "that Lutherans embrace not a new doctrine, but such as is old and apostolical, and profess thus the truly catholic faith." The Reformed Church here was of one mind with the Lutheran. Thus in Calvin's Catechism the first section treats of *Faith;* which is said to have the sum of its contents in the "formula of confession held in common by all Christians, commonly called the Apostles' Creed, and always received from the beginning among the pious, as being either derived from the mouth of the Apostles or faithfully collected from their writings." So in the Heidelberg Catechism the "articles of our catholic, undoubted Christian faith," as comprised in the same symbol, are made to underlie the whole doctrine of salvation. The Gallican, Belgic, and Helvetic Confessions, as well as the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, distinctly acknowledge the three Creeds, Apostolic, Nicene and Athanasian, as of universal obligation for the faith of Christians.

With the outward history of the Apostles' Creed corresponds in full its inward constitution. It agrees throughout with the actual objective movement of the Christian salvation, and represents the form it must necessarily have, as apprehend-

ed by faith, for the Christian consciousness. It is not the product of reflection, employed with the doctrinal statements of the Bible; it is drawn rather from the direct contemplation of Christ, the living principle of the Gospel, and is the first utterance of what the faith of the Church saw in Him from the beginning, as being the brightness of the Father's glory and the revelation of all grace and truth for the world. Apprehended in this manner, Christ and Christianity were no doctrine simply, no theory for the understanding, but a grand act or drama of the most real kind, by which God was seen entering the world through the mystery of the Incarnation, and carrying out the work of man's redemption in an objective, historical way, reaching through all time. Thus objective and real, the Christian salvation necessarily determined its own form; and this then determined necessarily also the form of its believing apprehension in the mind of the Church. The fundamental consciousness of the Church here must be in harmony with its object, the fundamental movement of Christianity itself; otherwise it would be no faith at all, but fancy only or opinion. The early creeds then which were in truth as we have seen but one creed (authentically fixed for general use at last in what we now call the Apostles' Creed), as the expression of this consciousness, could have only one general order and shape, answerable to what was thus apprehended as real in the Christian mystery itself. The organization of the Creed, in this view, is not a matter of indifference; as though it were the result of accident or mere subjective schematization; it is ruled by the actual movement of its object, the historical manifestation of the Holy Trinity in Christ, and the historical consequences of his Incarnation in his own Person and in the Church, on to the resurrection of the dead and the life everlasting. The form of the symbol thus is just as necessary as its matter. Christianity fundamentally is this array of facts, and this order of facts, and no other. In the creed we have not only the primordial constituents of the Christian faith, but the only construction of them also which can be regarded as true. Those who dream of other possible better summaries

of the "first principles" of Christianity, either in the way of different matter or in the way of different form, only show that they have not entered properly into the sense of the Creed, and that faith for them is not the same thing it was held to be in the early Church. As there is but one Christianity (one historical movement of the Mystery of Godliness) objectively, so there can be but one true way of apprehending it by faith; and that way we have presented to us in the Apostles' Creed.

It lies in the very conception of the symbol as now given, that it moves throughout in the sphere of faith. So much is signified at once by its name. It has to do from beginning to end with things, which are real and true only in the supernatural order of life that has been introduced into the world by Jesus Christ. All its articles are mysteries; not to be certified or measured by the natural understanding of men; not to be settled in the first place by empirical observation or logical proof; but authenticating themselves rather to the Christian consciousness in an *a priori* way, as necessary deductions from the primary fact of Christianity, the actual coming of Christ in the flesh. The assumption is, in this view, that they may be believed, nay *must* be believed if Christ is true, even where there is no power to understand or explain fully what they mean. To believe in Christ necessarily involves the belief of all that His advent is represented as drawing after it in the Creed; the consciousness of the Church, exercised with the problem of what it felt itself to possess in His Person, found itself shut up from the beginning, we may say, to each successive point, as the necessary expression of what was comprehended in its faith, over against all surrounding infidelity and heresy. And so still; we cannot break off the onward flow of this confession at any one point, so as to hold a portion of it only without regard to what comes after. All its parts are organically bound together. They represent the movement of one and the same fact. We must believe all or nothing.

We have a right to say thus, that the Apostles' Creed is the deepest, and for that reason the most comprehensive also of all Christian symbols or confessions of faith. It lies at the foun-

dation of all evangelical unity, and forms in this way the last basis and bond of common comprehension in the general conception of the Church. No religious community refusing to stand on this basis, no religious teacher pretending to construct Christianity on any other foundation, can have any right to claim footing in the Gospel, or fellowship with the Apostles.

Works on the subject: *King* (Lord), History of the Apostles' Creed, with Critical Observations, 5 edit. London, 1738, (translated into Latin by *Olearius*); *J. D. Vossius*, De Tribus Symbolis Dissert. Amstel. 1701, fol.; *H. Witsius*, Dissertation on what is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, translated from the Latin by *D. Fraser; Pearson* (Bishop), On the Creed; *Möhler*, Einheit der Kirche, oder Princip des Katholicismus im Geiste der Kirchenväter der ersten 3 Jahrhunderte, Tüb., 1825; *Rudelbach*, die Bedeutung des Apostolischen Symbolums, 1844; *J. Stockmeier*, über Entstehung des Apostolischen Symbolums, 1846; *Meyers*, De Symbol. Apostol. Treviris, 1849; *W. W. Harvey*, History and Theology of the Three Creeds, 2 vols., 1855.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

LANGE'S COMMENTARY.

It is known to the readers of this REVIEW that this commentary of the Old and New Testaments is appearing in English, under the supervision of Dr. Schaff. The volumes thus far issued have attained a popularity beyond that of any other commentary that has ever been published in this country.

We have received the last two volumes thus far issued, which have been already favorably noticed by the religious press generally. The first is a commentary on the book of Genesis, by Dr. Lange himself, translated, with valuable additions, by Prof. Taylor Lewis, LL.D., and A. Gosman, D.D.; the second volume contains commentaries on the, epistles to the Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews, by C. A. Auberlen, and C. J. Riggenbach, I. J. Van Oosterzee, D.D., and Carl Bernhard Moll, translated by John Lillie, D.D., E. A. Washbur, D.D., E. Harswood, D.D., Horatio B. Hackett, D.D., and A. C. Kendrick, D.D.

The first of these volumes contains a complete Theological and Homiletical Introduction to the Old Testament, besides a special Introduction to the book of Genesis. Special interest attaches to this volume, on account of the position it occupies as the first book of the Bible, and the attacks that have recently been made upon it and the whole Pentateuch, by Bishop Colenso, and others of similar skeptical tendencies. It may be specially commended also to those, who have become more or less familiar with Lange's theological system. It is known, that he was regarded with special favor as a theologian by the lamented Dr. H. Harbaugh. His favorite views on ideal Christology serve to bring out in more than usual prominence the idea of the eternal God-man as involved in the first creation. For instance, in his Doctrinal and Ethical remarks on the first chapter of Genesis: "Here comes especially into consideration the relation of the doctrine of the creation to the Logos, John i. 1–3. The first verse of Genesis clearly forms the ground presupposed in that passage, God spake; through his word he created the world, says Genesis; his word is a personal divine life, says John and the New Testament in general, especially Col. i. 15–19; ch. ii. 3–9. According to Genesis everything is created through the idea of man in the image of God, with a view to this man; according to the New Testament it is through the idea of Christ, who is the principle of humanity, with a view to Christ. As Adam was the principal of the creation, so is Christ the principal of humanity. Therefore it reads: 'God hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world' (Eph. i. 4; comp. John xvii. 5). The creation is, in its most essential point, the production of the eternal God-man in the eternal to-day. In man nature has passed beyond itself, from the relative, symbolical independence, to the perfected and real, to freedom; it has in him the mediator of its redemption, of its glorification. The beautiful cosmos, this unity of all varieties, which combines in it an endless complex of unities, to the production of external harmony and beauty, has, in Christ, the most beautiful of the children of men, its middle point, the centre of its ideal beauty. Finally, the first æon, which is fixed by the life of Adam, has for its core, its root, and its aim, the second æon fixed by Christ."

The work of translating could not have fallen into better hands than Prof. Taylor Lewis, whose acknowledged reputation as a thorough biblical scholar and theologian will be sufficient to ensure to all, the ability and faithfulness with which he has done his work.

We trust that these volumes will soon find their way, if they have not done so already, into the libraries of our ministers, and also of others. No family can fail to be profited by having so valuable an assistance in reading the Holy Scriptures. They are published by *Charles Scribner & Co.*, 654 Broadway, New York.

PROBLEMS OF THE AGE; WITH STUDIES IN ST. AUGUSTINE ON KINDRED TOPICS, by the Rev. Augustine F. Hewitt, of the Congregation of St. Paul. New York: The Catholic Publication House, 126 Nassau Street, 1868.

The special problems discussed in this handsome volume of over 400 pages, as we are told in the preface, relate to the harmony and analogy between natural or rational theology and certain doctrines of revealed or supernatural theology. Some idea of the topics discussed may be gained by its table of contents: Chapter I, Introductory; II, Relation of the Credible Object to the Creditive Subject; III, The Being of God, the first article of the Creed; IV, The Revelation of the Supernatural Order, and its relation to the primitive idea of Reason; V, The Trinity of Persons included in the one Divine Essence; VI, The dogma of Creation—The Principle, Archetype, and End of the Creative Act; VII, The End of Creation metaphysically final, &c., &c.; VIII, A further explanation of the Supernatural Order; IX, The State of Probation, &c.; X, The Original State of the First Parents of Mankind, &c.; XI, The Mystery of Redemption; XII, The Catholic Church, &c.; XIII, The Final destruction of Angels and Men, &c. It will thus be seen, that the topics discussed are taken up in the order of the Apostles' Creed. They are treated, of course, from the Roman Catholic standpoint. The special object had in view is to show, that revealed religion, though above, is not contrary to reason. It is but just to say, that the discussions are of the most able character, far above much of the theological writing of our day. The author shows himself to be an accomplished scholar, abundantly at home in the region of Philosophy, or pure thinking.

He starts with the consciousness of God, which is the basis in man for the development of his religious nature. This consciousness, in order to attain to a correct knowledge of God, must be met by a revelation, or rather *is* thus met by an authority which asserts itself as divine, being that of God Himself. To reject this authority is unreasonable. The author here falls into the error, into which some Protestant theologians also fall, viz., that revealed religion comes with such reasonable demonstration as to compel the assent of the reason. True, he states that his object is not to beget faith by a process of reasoning; this cannot be done. He would only remove those difficulties which lie in the outer vestibule. Still we think sufficient account is not made, even here, of the moral side of man's nature. Reason, or philosophy, evidently has a work to perform in combating the objections to Christianity urged in the sphere of reason. It can be proved that only the fool denies that there is a God. Philosophy also serves a good purpose in the case of a believer, in showing him that his faith does not contradict reason.

But the strongest appeal, after all, must be made to man's moral nature. This was the appeal our Saviour made. There must be a certain moral status or attitude in man, which, by the aid of divine grace, responds to the revelation when made. Where men, by their own act, vitiate this moral status, the truth will be rejected, and no amount of reasoning can lead them to accept it. The Roman Catholic presents authority, the Protestant often presents what he calls evidences, but both fall short of leading men in unbelief to assent to the truth.

We find the treatment of the atonement quite as unsatisfactory as the theories which are discarded. On the subject of the fall, and original sin, the view is the semi-pelagian view of the Roman Church. Much that is beautiful is presented on the subject of the Incarnation.

Every one must admire the earnestness and untiring industry of the Paulist Fathers, under whose auspices Catholic publications are issued and scattered broadcast, thick as the autumn leaves. They seem determined to outdo even Protestants. They adapt themselves to the American public, and seem especially to be addressing themselves to Protestants. They have already secured a listening and attentive audience in New England, as may be seen from the favorable notice given them in the Atlantic Monthly. We shall not be at all surprised, if New England takes lovingly to this opposite extreme, and becomes Roman Catholic. The way to meet Romanism successfully is to avoid the Rationalism into which Puritanism has so largely fallen.

THE FIVE BOOKS OF QUINTUS SEPT, FLOR. TERTULLIANUS AGAINST MARCION, translated by Peter Holmes, D. D., F. R. A. S., Domestic Chaplain to the Right Honorable the Countess of Rothes. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street; London, Hamilton & Co.; Dublin, John Robertson & Co.

THE WRITINGS OF CYPRIAN, BISHOP OF CARTHAGE, Translated by Rev. Robert Ernest Wallis, Ph. D., Senior Priest of Wells Cathedral, and Incumbent of Christ Church, Coxley, Somerset. Vol. 1, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark & Co.

The above are volumes VII. and VIII. of the Ante-Nicene Library, containing translations of the Fathers down to A. D. 325, edited by the Rev. Alexander Roberts, D. D., and James Donaldson, LL. D. The enterprise of translating into the English tongue, and publishing such an edition of the Ante-Nicene Fathers is worthy of all commendation and encouragement. We have no doubt that the volumes, as they are now issued, and also, in time to come, will find a ready sale. In all directions there is a revival of interest in the literature of the early Church. Protestantism is coming to feel itself called more than ever to claim and maintain its patrimony in that period of Church History. Its very existence as a continuation historically of the one Holy Catholic Church requires this. The separate principles of the Reformation must find their proper position as involved in the broader principle of Christianity. The principle of Protestantism is not itself the principle of Christianity, but only one of the processes through which this latter develops itself in the onward movement of the Church. Hence, as Protestants we cannot start with the Reformation, but must find the beginning of our Protestant Church-life, where the whole Church finds its beginning. This leads to the desire to study the history of the early Church, and these volumes will serve to satisfy this want on the part of many, who have not access to

the writings of the Fathers in the original. Even for the professional student, to whom for critical uses they can be of no service, they will be acceptable; but most of all to those ministers and certain laymen, who have neither the time nor preparation to study them in their original language, will this translation be a gracious help. We commend this library to our ministers generally, especially in view of the moderate expense incurred in procuring it as it is issued from time to time. They can be had of SMITH, ENGLISH & Co., No. 23 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia.

ANALYTICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS, Tracing the Train of Thought by the aid of Parallelism, with Notes and Dissertation on the Principal Difficulties connected with the exposition of the Epistle, by John Forbes, LL. D., Edinburgh. Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1868.

There is no doubt but that the author gets hold of the key to the proper meaning of this Epistle, in the use of his favorite principle of parallelism. The parallel, especially between Adam and Christ, is taken as the key note. The result of his investigation leads him to repudiate the mechanical theory of imputation, as advocated by Dr. Hodge, against whose views on this subject the notes are made principally to bear. We think he is not entirely consistent throughout with his own theory, but he is clearly in advance of, and nearer to the truth than the common Presbyterian theory on the subject of imputation.

THE BOOK OF THE PROPHET JEREMIAH, AND THAT OF THE LAMENTATIONS, Translated from the original Hebrew, with a Commentary, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical, by E. Henderson, D. D. Andover: Warren F. Draper; Boston: W. H. Halliday & Co., No. 58 and 60 Cornhill; Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., 1868.

This Commentary consists of a translation of the original text together with critical Philological and Exegetical notes.

In general the work is marked by a pleasing absence of attempts at the new and conjectural. Old and cherished opinions are in no case given up, and the author does not think too highly of the wonders of criticism. The book is unambitious. The results are mostly reliable, but the means by which they are attained are not satisfactorily given. The author does not discuss the disputed points at all, which is indeed in many cases to be praised, when for instance the point is raised on capricious or weakly sustained critical grounds. But, for instance in reference to the fiftieth chapter, we would desire to see the question sifted by the *author* rather than referred to a work inaccessible to nearly all for whom the author wrote.

On the other hand, we miss a doctrinal discussion of many points. True, the author does not pretend to give doctrinal notes, but why did he not to a suitable degree? Thus with regard to fiftieth chapter, ver.

5. A closer treatment of the doctrinal side of this verse would be acceptable, especially as, from the days of Origen down to this day, it has been looked upon as teaching, not only a fore-ordination on the part of God, but of a *pre-existence* of the soul.

The author has followed the division into chapters. We think it a pity, that he did not cut loose from them, and divide strictly as a critical division demands.

The remarks at the heads of the chapters are perspicuous and instructive. The notes usually give a fixed definite result, and are not too copious. The author's feelings seem scarcely to influence his representations. He is calm and cool—too much so for Jeremiah.

The work is a good explanation of Jeremiah, but furnishes but little of that which most ministers think they need.

The translation is excellent, and throws light on whole passages. It is relatively the best part of the whole book. K.

Moral Uses of Dark Things, by Horace Bushnell. New York, Charles Scribner & Co., 1868.

This volume of about 350 pages is made up of a series of articles published in the *Hours at Home*. We read some of them with much interest while they were appearing in that Magazine, and we have read them over again in this volume with increased interest and pleasure. Dr. Bushnell is too well known to the readers of this Review to need any commendation from us as a solid thinker, and a clear, vigorous writer. He is clearly one of the leading minds of this country. His works on *Nature and the Supernatural*, *Vicarious Sacrifice*, *Christian Nurture*, *&c.*, fairly entitle him to be ranked among the first thinkers and theologians of our times.

The Essays before us are not formally woven into a treatise, and yet it is plain, in reading them, that they are most intimately related to each other. Dr. Bushnell has uttered some profound thoughts in regard to the relation of sin to God. He grapples here with a side of creation, which calls up the same line of thought. *Physical Pain*, *Winter*, *Things Unsightly and Disgustful*, *Plague and Pestilence*, *Insanity*, *Non-Intercourse between Worlds*, *Night and Sleep*, *The Sea*, such are some of the subjects he discusses.

Let no one think, that because these essays have already been given to the public through the pages of a Monthly, they are any the less suitable for a book. The very fact, that they have been published in their present form is an assurance, that they belong to the solid writings of the day—writings that will last. We recommend the book as eminently suitable for a family library. Its reading is all the more pleasant from the form in which the matter is arranged. To be had of Smith, English & Co., No. 23 North Sixth St., Philadelphia.

The Human Intellect; with an introduction upon Psychology and the Soul. By Noah Porter, D. D., Clark Professor of Moral

Philosophy and Metaphysics in Yale College. New York; Charles Scribner & Company. 1868.

This is a huge volume of nearly 700 pages. It might seem at first, that an author could manage to put down in smaller compass what needs to be set before a student on the subject of the human intellect. The students of Rauch's Anthropology and Psychology, a volume of about one quarter the dimensions of this volume of Dr. Porter's, would think so. And we think there is a great deal of unnecessary lumber in the book, especially as it is prepared as a text book for Colleges. True, the coarse print in it appropriates only a portion, perhaps the smaller portion, while the remarks and notes are copious, so that the part to be studied for recitation is thus considerably reduced. But we think it would be better to leave some things to be said by the professor, who could better satisfy the wants in the case by oral explanations and criticisms.

Another reason, however, for the extensive size of this treatise is the fact, that the author has combined in it Psychology and Philosophy or Metaphysics. As things are in the Colleges of this country this may be desirable. Philosophy as yet has been but little studied. We remember well when all that was studied at Princeton was *Locke on the Human Understanding* and some like empirical treatise on Moral Philosophy or Ethics. In another, a shorter work on Mental Philosophy was all that the students got in Philosophy, which was simply no Philosophy at all. This work of Prof. Porter's gives at least some hints and criticisms of the different systems of Philosophy, and students can look out a little on this world of thought that has engaged the greatest intellects of all ages.

We think it would be better, however, to keep the science of Psychology within its own proper limits, and treat of Philosophy proper in its own field. The two are nearly related, it is true, but they are sufficiently distinct to be studied each in its own field. We have been pleased with the general position of the book, and we regard it as certainly an advance in this department on what has yet been produced in this country.

We regard it as defective, as we do also Rauch's Psychology, in that it fails to bring out the Trichotomy of man. It seems remarkable to us, that men should study the nature of body and soul, but shrink from taking into the field of their investigations the *Spirit*. Its existence is a matter of consciousness just as really as that of body or soul, and is just as clearly taught in the Bible. We would not quarrel about nomenclature. But this is clearly a point that concerns more than mere terms.

Neither can we understand why it is, that, in Christian Colleges, and by Christian authors, the light of Christianity is so studiously shut out from such a science. So much is this the case, that it would seem strange to us now to stumble upon a chance quotation from the Word of God in a work on the human soul. Shakspeare is quoted,

but God's word is not. Why is this? Must we be heathen in order to be scientific? One would think, at least, that the revelation made to the world in Christ, that the inspired record of the Bible, would throw some light on the knowledge of man. Why then not freely take and use this light? In reading our text books in the various departments of learning in this age, one would be led to suppose, that the facts of divine revelation are nice enough for fancy, but when you want substantial truth, facts, you must rest only on the intellect of man. Is not this infidelity? Our Psychologies could be raised to a new position by using what is given in the Bible as to man's being. As the word goes, however, this work of Prof. Porter is Christian. We commend it to all who take interest in the subject which it discusses. To be had of Smith, English & Co., No 23 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia.

Alms-giving: The True Christian Mode. A tract is sometimes as much as a book. Indeed for the people who wish to get the gist of what a man teaches, the prophecy he has to make, without the process through which he has passed in his own mind, it is better than a book. In this age especially is it necessary to send out instruction in brief form. If in addition to this it is considered that many people are not able to buy books on all the important subjects which ought to be brought to their notice, it will appear at once, that the issuing of a tract is an important work for the Church, provided the tract be of the proper character.

The subject of the tract here noticed is one which commends itself to the German Reformed Church. The subject of worship has agitated us for years past, and the subject of Christian benevolence no less. Now what we need is that these two should be properly brought together in one. Is alms-giving a part of worship? We believe it is. It is so regarded in the New Testament. This is forcibly brought out in the tract itself. If then it is a part of worship, as much so as prayer itself, then it belongs properly to the Order of Worship. A place should be provided for it in the regular service of the Lord's day. This provision is made in the Liturgy. Now what we need is, that our people should be brought to see the propriety of presenting their offerings as here provided.

They will thus become regular, and the question of systematic benevolence, as it is sometimes called, will at the same time be answered. *On the first day of the week* was the Apostles' plan. In conjunction with the prayer and praise that are offered at the Altar, these offerings should be presented.

Not only systematic benevolence is here provided for, but a method which will reach all the people. Better this, we think, than any plan which involves mere calculation or resolution on the part of the individual. They will be trained to give every Sunday, and of course at every Communion season. As the Communion is the central service of all our worship, such an occasion will of course

appeal more strongly to the members, and the offerings given then will be large in proportion, only let our ministers attend to the matter, and the people will respond.

The author of the above named Tract is a sufficient guarantee for the matter it presents. It was furnished by the lamented Dr. Harbaugh, as one of the last works of his useful life. It presents the substance of his excellent article on the subject, which appeared in this Review. We cordially commend it for general circulation. To be had of S. R. Fisher & Co., No. 54 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia. Price 25 cents per dozen, or $2 00 per hundred copies.

TABLE PRAYER. TRACT NO. 2. This little Tract on an important subject, also commends itself to notice. It very briefly presents the reasons for prayer at the table, and furnishes a number of appropriate forms. The subject of forms of prayer is coming more and more to be regarded in a new light. Especially are they inquired after for family use. Parents, who feel the duty of family prayer pressing upon them, and who yet feel themselves unable properly to discharge it, want just what is here provided. This tract was prepared by the Rev. A. Carl Whitmer. To be had of S. R. Fisher & Co, No. 54 North Sixth Street. Price 75 cents per hundred copies.

THE COTTAGE BY THE LAKE. Translated from the German, by Miss R. H. Schively. Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication. 1869. Pp. 160.

Germany is world-renowned for its literature. This is true, not only in regard to writings of great profundity and research, but also with respect to those of the lighter kind. Among the latter, the works of M. Claudius occupy a prominent place. They are especially distinguished for their moving pathos and tenderness, and the vein of evangelical piety by which they are pervaded. The Cottage by the Lake possesses all these characteristics, and the happy rendering of it into English by Miss Schively will make it peculiarly acceptable to the general reader. It furnishes a striking exemplification of that explicit trust in an over-ruling providence, for which the Swiss nation are peculiarly distinguished, and which, as in this particular case, greatly alleviates the trials of the present life, and causes them, in the end, to result in much good.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW

APRIL, 1869.

Art. I.—NOMINALISM AND REALISM.*

BY REV. J. H. DUBBS, A. M., POTTSTOWN, PA.

Not many years ago, that period of human history which, in round numbers, may be said to extend from the sixth to the sixteenth century of the Christian era, was almost universally known as, "*the Dark Ages.*" Many persons, who were otherwise well informed, implicitly believed, that those unhappy ages were destitute of even a single ray of intellectual or religious light, to break the gloom of their Cimmerian darkness. The poet Coleridge, however, as early as half-a-century ago, ventured to assert, in opposition to the reigning sentiment, that "the Middle Ages are dark only to those who themselves have not light enough to read them." Yet perhaps this bold assertion touches an opposite extreme. In one sense, the Middle Ages were indeed dark, and must remain obscure to every modern student. It could not well be otherwise, than that there should be much darkness in the period that immediately succeeded the subversion of the ancient civilization of the Ro-

* Realismus und Nominalismus in ihrem Einfluss auf die Dogmatischen Systeme des Mittelalters. Ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte und zur Geschichte der Philosophie, aus den Quellen dargestellt von H. O. Koehler, Pastor zu Gr. Vielen in Mecklenburg. Gotha, verlag von Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1858. 8vo. pp. 192.

man empire, and the irruption of the barbaric hordes of Northern Europe. But the light was even then struggling with the darkness. The period which gave birth to a Dante, a Raphael, a Michael Angelo, and a host of other great poets, painters, and sculptors, cannot have been entirely destitute of light; and we pity the man who can gaze on the stupendous cathedrals of the old world,—so exquisitely beautiful and harmonious in all their parts, that the poets have fancifully designated their architecture as "frozen music"—and yet imagine them to be the production of a barbarous age.

There has been, of late years, a mediæval *renaissance* in the world of literature and art; and the "great masters" are more highly honored than ever before. The fact seems, however, to be quietly ignored, that not all the mediæval men of genius were artists or poets. Is it right to forget the great thinkers, before whose intellectual powers the great masters of art bowed with profoundest reverence? Ought we not also to keep green the memory of the scholastic doctors, whose systems of Theology have been declared, by those who know what they affirm, to be more stupendous as works of genius than the very cathedrals which the world so loudly praises?

We have been led into this train of thought by reading a monograph on "Realism and Nominalism," from the pen of H. O. Koehler, pastor at Gross Vielen in Mecklenburg. The author is evidently a man of very considerable ability, conjoined with a degree of modesty that is as laudable as it is rare. While he has studied his subject with German patience and research, making use at the same time of the rich treasures of the libraries of Rostock, Göttingen, and Hamburg, he yet confesses, that his little book is necessarily very incomplete; and expresses the hope that it may soon be superseded by some great work, that may do complete justice to a subject that occupied the attention of the greatest minds of Christendom, for more than five hundred years. He finally thanks his publisher, in the most *naive* manner imaginable, for venturing to publish a book for which he can hardly anticipate an extensive sale.

We rather like this book. It possesses a clearness which is

rare in the discussion of a subject so abstruse. The author does not himself philosophize, while he seeks to give us an idea of the influence of Nominalism and Realism on the Dogmatic systems of the Middle Ages. Yet, after all, we cannot resist the conclusion, that he occupies a stand-point very different from our own. This will, we think, become evident during the course of our present *resumè;* though we have not the inclination, as we have not the ability, to join issue with him in a tournament of the pen. We moderns can hardly hope to familiarize ourselves with all the details of the Titanic conflict which is here depicted, and our first care must be, to save our heads from the falling rocks and mountains.

Our author introduces his subject by instituting a comparison between the periods of patristic and of scholastic Theology. The first six centuries of the history of the church were principally occupied with the development of Christian doctrine, in opposition to the early heresies; the subsequent period with the construction of theological systems. Though the Monothelite and Adoptian controversies extend into the middle ages, they do not militate against this statement; for they were but corollaries of the Monophysite and Arian controversies, the last mutterings of storms that had already spent their strength. The great doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and of sin, had been settled for all time at the great councils of Nice, Ephesus, and Chalcedon; but there was no settlement, in this sense, of the questions raised by Paschasius and Lanfranc, concerning the Eucharist; by Peter the Lombard, concerning the seven sacraments; and by their successors, concerning eschatology and other important subjects. Even those doctrines which had come to be accepted by the church during the middle ages, were generally unable to withstand the destructive forces that were brought to bear upon them in the sixteenth century. It is certain, then, that the mediæval development of doctrine was insignificant, when compared either with the patristic period or with the subsequent period of the Reformation.

Our author finds the cause of all this in the condition of the Germanic race, which was even then the most important in

Christendom. It had but recently been reclaimed from heathenism; and it was therefore its main problem, to become acquainted with the contents of the truth, and to arrange scientifically the rich treasures of the past. It was but right that this should be so; for faithfulness to the Gospel, as we have received it, must be at all times our first obligation. The development of doctrine, on the other hand, must take place at times and under conditions prepared by God Himself, and must be the normal evolution of the life of Christ in His Church. It is just as wrong, then, to blame the schoolmen for making use almost exclusively of the materials furnished by former ages, as it would be to disparage the great divines of the seventeenth century, because they devoted their best power to systematizing the Theology of the Reformation.

In philosophy the Middle Ages were also, to a great extent, dependent on the past. At first Platonism was taught, according to the method of Aristotle; but at a later period the philosophy of the Stagyrite reigned supreme. In the eleventh century the admiration for his dialectics became so universal, as to be subsequently designated by Roger Bacon, as "*Aristotelemania.*" In those ages an appropriate quotation from Aristotle was sufficient for the practical settlement of almost any knotty question. It was, indeed, almost enough to say, with the Pythagoreans: "He himself has said it."

Our author has well remarked, that we must not be too hard on the schoolmen for thus slavishly following in the footsteps of Plato and Aristotle. Not every age produces great original philosophers; and the schoolmen, to say the least, had no reason to be ashamed of their Grecian models.

What has been here said, will prepare us for an intelligent idea of the Theological systems of such men as Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, and others. They all made use of Philosophy for the purpose of discovering the contents of their faith; while they held firmly to the principles of Augustine, that "*faith precedes knowledge,*" and that "*there is no contradiction between faith and knowledge.*" Towards the end of the eleventh century, however, a conflict arose, between two schools

of philosophy and theology, that are respectively known in history as Nominalists and Realists. "This struggle," remarks our author, "went on, with varying fortunes, to the end of the Middle Ages." He might have added, that the questions at issue have never been definitely settled; but are constantly reappearing in some new form or other; though, indeed, the writers of modern times have but rarely adopted the watchwords of mediæval speculation.

As scholasticism was, to a great extent, dependent on ancient Greece for its philosophy, it is necessary that we should there seek for the roots of the conflict.

According to Plato, there are certain *universal conceptions*, which are innate in the reason of man; which lie at the foundation of all thought, and precede the particular and individual. These universal conceptions are the representatives of the actual and eternal ideas of the Divine mind, according to which all particular existences are formed; and have a real, permanent existence. When reason, therefore, beholds created existences, it is its mission to refer them back to their original types, and thus discover that which really exists, instead of that which is transitory and illusory. Philosophy, therefore, according to Plato, is the art of apprehending the universal and necessary, and thus discovering the real nature of all created existences.

Aristotle, though a pupil of Plato, was brought by his study of nature to occupy a somewhat different standpoint. It is, however, a mistake to suppose, that he denied the reality of universal conceptions, altogether; and, therefore, deserves to be called "the father of Mediæval Nominalism." This is a view that has been long exploded; and we are rather surprised to see it reiterated, in almost so many words, in Appleton's "New American Cyclopædia."

It must be confessed, that it is somewhat difficult to come to a full understanding of the views of Aristotle on this subject; and it has been remarked, by Sir William Hamilton, as a curious fact, that "different philosophers have maintained, that Aristotle was a Realist, a Conceptualist, and a Nominalist in the

strictest sense." A recent writer in the "Dublin University Magazine," who quotes largely from Schwegler, seems, however, in accordance with the views of our author, to show conclusively, that Plato and Aristotle certainly agreed with reference to the real existence of *universals*, or generic conceptions; and that they consequently differed more as to the manner than as to the matter of their thought.

In his method, Aristotle proceeds from the particular to the general. He says, "All knowledge is of two kinds, mediate and immediate. We learn to know immediately only the particular and individual; then mediately the universal; and the logical conclusions of reason are the only way of deducing the mediately true from the immediately true. In things in their diversity, the universal alone exists. It is more than a mere agreement of individual existences with preconceived ideals; the universal becomes actualized in the particular, and both are alike eternal." To use mediæval terms, Plato held to "*universalia ante rem;*" while Aristotle declared for "*universalia in re*," which is something altogether different from the "*universalia post rem*" of the Nominalists.

The latter view seems to have been first advanced by Zeno, the founder of the Stoic school. He held that we derive all our knowledge from the senses. From external impressions we gain certain conceptions, which have no connection with each other; but reason, as the ruling power of the soul, unites these conceptions, and thus forms the universal. This, according to Zeno, is the only way of discovering the truth; and to apprehend it in this way, as derived from particular conceptions, is the peculiar business of dialectics.

Our author asserts, that the doctrines of Zeno are almost pure Nominalism; but confesses that it is impossible to make out any historical connection between them. The writings of Zeno had not been translated into Latin, and he knows of no schoolmen, except the venerable Bede and John Scotus Erigena, who were acquainted with Greek.

With Realism he has no such difficulty. He deduces it from Plato but, it seems to us, in the most mechanical way. He can-

not understand how Platonic ideas of being and generic unity should have found their way into Christian theology, except through the partial and imperfect translations of Chalcidius, Apuleius, and Macrobius. He has not a word to say of the fact, that at the advent of our blessed Saviour the whole world was full of Platonism; and that it was believed by many of the early Christians to have been, in some sort, a preparation for the purer doctrines of Christianity. Did he designedly forget, that the apostles themselves, to say the least, often make use of Platonic forms of thought for the purpose of communicating Christian mysteries? Nay, more, "the Platonic idea of generic unity," as our author would call it, is plainly communicated by the apostles, as a Christian truth, in connection, for instance, with the doctrine of the Church, which cannot in any other sense be said to be *really* "the body of Christ." It strikes us, that our author sometimes mistakes Christian verities for Platonic speculations; and that what he chooses to call the "blind realism" of the ages before Anselm and Roscellinus, may, after all, have been the bright light of that Christian faith, of which Platonism is but the faint aurora. It has frequently dazzled men's eyes, and caused them to mistake it for darkness.

The Nominalist heresy, as we have seen, began to afflict the church in the latter half of the eleventh century. In its inception, the conflict may have appeared, to the superficial observer, to be purely philosophic, and of trifling importance. Roscellinus, a canon of Compeigne, asserted, "that the notions of universals, of genera and species, were possessed of no reality; but were mere words (*flatus vocis*), employed to designate qualities common to different individuals."

However insignificant and unimportant all this may appear to be, we have the authority of no less a work than the "Encyclopædia Britannica" for asserting, that "this theory is a fundamental one in the theory of human knowledge." "If every *genus*," continues this eminent authority, "is only a mere word, it follows that individuals are the only realities, and that the senses are at bottom the only sources of knowledge. And not only so, but on this theory no absolute affirmation re-

specting truth is possible, for such absolute affirmation involves of necessity a general idea; which, *ex hypothesi*, is destitute of real validity. Hence we have rationalism at the next remove."

Roscellinus appears to have been a celebrated teacher of Theology, who had many pupils. He is said to have been himself a pupil of a certain Johannes Sophista, who held similar views, but is otherwise entirely forgotten.

By applying his theory to theology, Roscellinus felt himself necessitated to teach Tritheism; for if individuals be the only realities, it follows, that the persons in the blessed Trinity cannot be one in essence. But the questions thus raised reach further still. If individuals be the only realities, how can Christ become the head of our race? How can He have assumed our humanity, when humanity, as such, does not really exist? The Church, too, which He died to save, has no real objective existence; it is a mere empty term, loosely applied to a vast number of individual believers. The sacraments thus become empty ceremonials; and in fact the whole of Christianity ceases to be a supernatural creation which challenges our faith, and sinks down at once to be a mere matter of individual opinion.

We do not of course, pretend to say, that either Roscellinus or his immediate successors went to these lengths in advocating their principle. Nurtured, as they had been, in the bosom of the church, they could hardly bring themselves publicly to deny the existence of their mother.

We can, however, easily understand, why it was that the church at once took alarm at the heresy of Roscellinus, and in the year 1092 cited him to appear at the council of Soissons. He appeared and recanted; but afterwards declared, that he had done so merely for fear of the people, who had become greatly embittered against him. He now fled to England, where he sought by every means in his power to spread his heresy. Here, however, he encountered an unbending opponent in the person of Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury, whom he appears to have previously most shamefully maligned. Being worsted in this conflict, he returned to France, where Bishop Ivo of

Chartres had pity on him, and after showing him much kindness, induced him finally to abjure his errors. He died as a canon of the Church in Tours.

The character of Anselm, the first victor over Nominalism, has always seemed to us to be one of the most glorious in history. "He wears," says a distinguished writer, "the triple *nimbus* of an ecclesiastical prince, a mighty theologian, and a saint of the Church." Elevated, in the year 1093, from a simple abbacy to the proud position of Archbishop of Canterbury and primate of all England, he labored with all his might to free the Church from secular dominion, and then to institute a thorough reformation of its discipline and the morals of the clergy. The account of his struggles with William Rufus, and his successor Henry I., has become a part of the history of England. He died on the 21st of April, 1109, at the age of seventy-six.

It is as a theologian that Anselm especially claims our attention on the present occasion. "He is one of the few theologians," said Dr. Schaff in the first number of the "Kirchenfreund," "who are held in almost equal veneration by both the Catholic and Protestant Churches. He was the Augustine of the middle ages; the father of that scholastic theology which sought to defend the traditional faith of the Church against all the objections of reason, and thus to manifest it as reason in its highest form; whose gigantic creations in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries have been justly compared to the Gothic cathedrals of those ages. * * * His theology stood in the most intimate connection with living piety; while his speculation was the fruit of a faith that constantly yearned to behold its beloved object more and more clearly."

We wish the author of the monograph before us had come to the consideration of the character of Anselm in a spirit somewhat similar to that manifested in the above citation; but he seems on the contrary, to place Anselm on a level with Roscellinus, as the mere leader of a theological party. This is unquestionably a mistaken view of the case. There was, indeed, a false realism in existence even before the days of Anselm—as

we find it manifested in the obscure and possibly pantheistic writings of Fredegisus and John Scotus Erigena,—but with these erratic views, the great archbishop had not the slightest sympathy. He sought rather to be the champion of the reality of Christ's kingdom—the defender of the truth against the most insidious forms of unbelief. When, then, our author dissects his writings—skillfully, we confess—for the purpose of discovering what he chooses to call his realistic tendencies, he proves nothing to our minds but what we knew before,—that Anselm earnestly held the ancient faith of the Church in opposition to the heresies of Roscellinus.

Nominalism now disappeared for a time from the theological arena, but continued to sustain itself as a philosophical system. Among its chief defenders, at this period, are mentioned Robert of Paris, Arnulf of Laon, and Raimbert of Lille; but we know little or nothing concerning the nature of their teachings. Joscelin, Bishop of Soissons, is also believed to have had an inclination towards Nominalism, but this is by no means certain.

Hildebert of Tours, or Mans, is said by Gieseler, to have elaborated the first complete system of scholastic theology. His works are, however, of little importance in this connection, as he sought only to reproduce the teachings of the Fathers in a systematic form. He is said, not to have been very profound, and to have laid it down as a principle, that it is better never to say anything striking, than to run the risk of being found in error.

Of greater importance, in connection with our subject, is William of Champeaux, who founded the celebrated school of St. Victor, about the year 1108. He is principally known by his conflict with his famous pupil Abelard. In avoiding the errors of Roscellinus, he seems to have rushed into the opposite extreme, and to have denied the real existence of individuals altogether. "Genera," according to him, "individualize themselves in particular beings in such a manner, that individuals differ only by the variety of their accidents, but are identical as to their essence or real nature." It would seem, therefore,

as though William of Champeaux had been in danger of running into pantheism. It is possible also, that to him may be attributed the paternity of the extreme realism that is even now current among theologians of the Church of Rome, and that crops out, especially, in their attempted explanation of the relation of substance to its accidents, in connection with the dogma of transubstantiation.

The most celebrated name in this period of the history of the Church, is unquestionably that of Peter Abelard. He is, however, less widely known for his mental acquirements than for his romantic personal history, which has become the prolific theme of many of our best modern poets. He was a man of great genius, who possessed wonderful oratorical powers, and thus attracted thousands of students. As a philosopher and theologian, it is, however, extremely difficult to estimate him properly. Our author, for instance, in direct opposition to every other authority we have had the opportunity of consulting, declares him to have been a moderate Realist, after the manner of Aristotle. We had always understood, that he was a decided opponent of Realism, and that he said in direct contradiction of the famous *dictum* of Anselm: "I must understand, in order that I may believe!" Other authorities generally call Abelard, the father of Conceptualism, of which third system the work before us has not a word to say. "He taught," according to the "Encyclopædia Britannica," "that individuals have an essential existence, and universals an existence ideally real. Genera are abstracted from particulars, and exist in the mind in the form of notions, or (as we now call them) *concepts*, and are held together by words, called general terms." But, after all, what is this but disguised Nominalism?

Indeed, Abelard seems to have been fond of disguising his real sentiments, by using the terminology of schools with which he was at variance. He would in this way teach an ancient heresy; then avoid the consequences by declaring that he had been grossly misunderstood; and finally reiterate the heresy in words that seemed to have the most orthodox sound. Thus, our author shows, we think conclusively, that he held Sabellian

views with reference to the Trinity, notwithstanding the fact, that he explicitly denied the charge, and sought with all possible dialectic skill, to explain it away. He could, however, not always hide his real sentiments from the vigilant eye of the Church. He was twice condemned for heresy, and his books were publicly burned.

Our present limits forbid us to dwell on the melancholy history of Abelard; or to follow our author through his careful analysis of his numerous writings. Though of scientific value, any attempt to reproduce it here would necessarily prove both uninteresting and unsatisfactory to the general reader.

The same must be said of that portion of the book which extends from the sixth to the twelfth chapter, and is devoted to the consideration of the systems of Gilbertus Porretanus, Peter Lombard, Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Bonaventura, and other great scholastic theologians. It is a *hortus siccus*,—beautiful even in its dryness, but utterly destitute of life. We are, however, astonished at the vast amount of reading displayed by the author; though he manifests not the slightest desire to parade his erudition, and rather compresses his notes into the smallest possible compass. It is enough for our present purpose to remark, that he finds all these great Doctors to have been more or less decided Realists, according to his understanding of the term.

The great conflict between the Thomists and the Scotists, according to him, was by no means identical with that between Nominalism and Realism, as has been sometimes asserted; it bore a stronger resemblance to some of the modern controversies concerning grace and free-will.

Indeed Nominalism seems to have almost died out, when it was revived, in the fourteenth century, by Durandus, Bishop of Meaux, and more especially by William Occam, a native of England, whom his disciples fondly called "the invincible doctor."

Durandus had been in his youth an ardent disciple of St. Thomas Aquinas; but in later life he differed from him altogether. Our author doubts whether he was ever a consistent

Nominalist; and prefers to class him with "the left wing of the Aristotelians"—whatever that may be. On the main question at issue, he stood, however, on almost the same ground that had previously been occupied by Roscellinus. Universals, according to his theory, either do not exist or are mere generalizations.

Realism had indeed, to a certain extent, conceded, that the universal may be deduced by a mental process from the visible and sensual; and St. Thomas had remarked, that the capacity of doing this was the main characteristic of an active mind; but created existences must, nevertheless be the actualizations of invisible, preëxisting generic forms. This, however, Durandus expressly denies; and declares, that the senses are the only sources of knowledge. Hence the amount of truth which can be received by the human mind is very small, indeed. In fact we can never be assured of truth at all. Material truth can never be apprehended by the mind, and formal truth only by a process of abstraction.

Such doctrines were a great shock to the philosophy and the theology of the age. If truth is only formal; if all knowledge of the universal is uncertain; and if the human reason can deal only with empirical knowledge—of what earthly use is philosophy, even as the handmaid of theology?

At this point Durandus, and his still more illustrious successor, William of Occam, avoided the rock on which former Nominalists had suffered shipwreck. They absolutely refused to apply their theories to matters of faith. "Faith and reason," they said, "are not on the same plane—they have nothing to do with each other. It is wrong, therefore, to seek by reason even to discern the contents of our faith; or to try to prove the truth of its articles; for to do so would be to attempt the impossible." "Faith," according to Durandus, "is a free gift of God, which authenticates the truths that reason cannot fathom, among which are the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, the teachings of the Fathers, and the doctrines of the Church of Rome."

In this way the later Nominalists generally avoided condem-

nation for heresy, which would otherwise, unquestionably, have been their fate. Indeed, they claimed to exalt the teachings of the Church more highly than all their predecessors. But with all this, there was in their writings a certain undercurrent of skepticism, which became especially evident after William of Occam had espoused the cause of Philip le Bel and Louis of Bavaria, in their struggle with the papal hierarchy. The Nominalist controversy thus came to have, to a certain extent, a political complexion; and the quarrel now raged so fiercely, that blood was often shed in consequence of it. At last Nominalism was again declared a heresy; and Louis XI commanded, that the books written by Nominalists should be chained to their places in the public libraries.

It was evident, however, that the days of Scholasticism were numbered. Its doctors seemed to have lost every vestige of originality; and their writings had degenerated into mere abstractions and subtleties, which have no interest for the modern reader. Great names are mentioned in the theological annals of those days, but to us they are names only. Scholasticism gradually disappeared, and mysticism arose in its place. The great conflict between Nominalism and Realism was never fully decided; but on the revival of letters it passed into forgetfulness, and was finally entirely supplanted by the greater conflict of the Reformation.

At this point our author brings his book to an abrupt conclusion. But the question naturally arises, Were the Nominalists really the forerunners of the Reformation, as has been sometimes asserted?

We value the Reformation too highly to think so. They rather prepared the way for modern rationalism, and for the low views of the Church and the means of grace which have, ever since their days, been current among certain professed Christians. It must not be forgotten that such men as Wickliffe, John Huss, and Jerome of Prague were not Nominalists but Realists. We have, at any rate, no occasion for seeking the sources of genuine Protestantism in the muddy streams of mediæval heresies. It is far better to regard the Reformation

of the sixteenth century as the legitimate culmination of a great movement *in* the Church, that based itself on the ancient faith, and was indeed, potentially involved in it from the very beginning. It thus ceases to be the work of a man, or of any number of men, and comes to be regarded, rather as the necessary product of all that had gone before. In this great movement, we believe, stood such men as John Tauler, Thomas a Kempis, and many others of the so-called mystics, who, while firmly resting their faith on the ancient Creeds, turned away from the thorny mazes of later Scholasticism, to feed on the green pastures of the word of God.

Though it would be difficult, if not impossible, to describe the Protean shapes which the ancient Nominalistic conflict has assumed in these latter days, it is, nevertheless, certain, that it has lost none of its intensity. Will it ever be brought to a definite conclusion? Yes!—in God's own good time; for God is Truth, and truth at last must gain the victory.

Art. II.—LUTHER'S TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES: THE NEW TESTAMENT.

A Contribution to the "Internal History and Relations of the Authorized English Bible and of the Texts and Versions which have influenced it."

By CHAS. P. KRAUTH, D.D.,
Norton Professor of Theology in the E. L. Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, and Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in the University of Pennsylvania.

LUTHER'S CALLING AS A TRANSLATOR OF THE SCRIPTURES.*

The author's best vindication of his vocation to a certain work must, in the nature of the case, be the work itself. The fact of success seems to dispense with the necessity of any argument, in advance, as to his fitness for the labor, on which he entered.

* The most important works on Luther's Bible are the following:

I.—In defence or criticism of his translation.

Beringer: Rettung. 1613.
Raithii: Vindiciæ. 1676.
A. H. Francke: Obs. Biblicae. 1695. Zehner: Probe. 1750.
Stier: Altes und Neues. 1828. (In defence of Meyer's Revision.)
" Darf Luther's Bibel, etc. 1836.
Rössler: De Vers. Luth. caute emend. 1836.

II.—Bibliography and History.

Mayer, J. F.: Hist. Vers. Luth. 1701.
Kraft: (1705–1734.)
Zeltner: Historie. 1727. Bertram: Giese: Nachricht. (1771.)
Palm: Historie—Götze. 1772.
" De Codicibus. 1735.
Gözen's: Sammlung. 1777.
Panzer: Entwurf. 1791.
Gœtz: Ueberblicke. 1824.
Schott: Geschichte. 1835. Bindseil (1841.)
Reuss: Gesch. d. Heil. Schriften. N. T. 1860.
Fritzsche: Bibelübersetzungen Deutsch. 1855. (in Herzog Real. Enc. III. 337.)
Popular Histories: Küster (1824) Weidemann (1834) K. Mann (1834) Krafft C. W. (1835).

We need no *a priori* proof, that Milton had a vocation as a poet, or Bacon as a philosopher, or Gerhard as a theologian. To argue it, is to argue in the sunlight the question of the sun's adaptation for shining. Luther's translation of the Bible is itself the invincible proof of his vocation to the work of preparing it. It shines its own evidence into the eyes of every one who opens it.

Nevertheless, it is not without historical interest, little as it is necessary logically, to look at the evidence of Luther's fitness for the work. Some of the facts which naturally attract our attention here, are the following:—

I. *Luther was well educated as a boy.* He went to school in Mansfield until he reached his fourteenth year; thence he went to Magdeburg; four years he spent at Eisenach, under the tuition of a teacher of whom Melanchthon testifies, that in the grammatical branches, the very ones which were so largely to become useful to Luther as a translator, he had no superior. Here he finished his school-days proper; already as a boy, by his great proficiency, giving indications of extraordinary talents and industry. Melanchthon says of him at this era: "As he had great genius, and a strong predisposition to eloquence, he speedily surpassed the other youths in the fullness and richness of his speech and of his writing, alike in prose and verse." Even as a boy, he was already marked out as a translator.

II. *Luther received a thorough collegiate education.* In 1501 he repaired to the College at Erfurt, where he was matriculated during the presidency of Truttvetter, whom he loved and venerated as a man and a teacher, and where he faithfully used all the advantages which surrounded him.

III. *Luther was a devoted student of the Hebrew and Greek.* In 1505, after his entrance into the cloister, Luther devoted himself with that earnestness which marked all he did, to the study of Hebrew and Greek. He had skillful teachers in both languages. As professor and preacher in Wittenberg, he continued both studies with great ardor. In Hebrew, Luther regarded the illustrious Reuchlin, the Gesenius of that day, as his

teacher, compensating for the want of his oral instruction by a thorough use of his writings. But Luther was not of the race of sciolists, who think, that because books can do much, they can do every thing. He knew the value of the living teacher. To obtain a more thorough mastery of Hebrew, he availed himself of the instruction of his learned colleague, Aurogallus, the Professor of the oriental languages at Wittenberg. When he was at Rome, in 1510, he took lessons in Hebrew from the erudite Rabbin Elias Levita. Luther was master of the Hebrew according to the standard of his time, as his cotemporaries, and learned men of a later date, among them, Scaliger, have acknowledged. "If Luther," says Fritzsche,* "was not the greatest Philologist of his time, he was yet sufficiently learned to see for himself, and to be able to form an independent judgment. What he lacked in philological profundity was compensated for in part by his eminent exegetical feeling, and by the fact that he had lived himself completely into the spirit of the Bible." Luther's first master in Greek was Erasmus, through his writings; his preceptor, both by the book and the lip, was Melanchthon. These were the greatest Greek scholars of the age. Luther happily styles Melanchthon, "most Grecian."

IV. With genius, the internal mental requisite, and learning, the means by which that genius could alone be brought to bear on the work of translation, Luther united *piety*. His soul was in affinity with the spirit of the Bible. He was a regenerate man. A De Wette may produce a translation which the man of taste admires, but he cannot translate for the people. We would not give a poem to a mathematician for translation, whatever might be his genius; still less would we give the words of the Spirit to the hand of a translator who had not the "mind of the Spirit." Luther, the man of faith, of fervent prayer, the man who was as lowly toward God as he was inflexible toward men, Luther was called to that work of translation in which generations of the past have found a guide to heaven,

* Herzog's Real. Encyc. iii. 340.

and for which millions of our race, in generations yet to come, will rise up and pronounce him blessed.

V. All these gifts and graces as a translator found their channel in his *matchless German.* In this he stood supreme. The most German of Germans, towering above the great yet absolutely one of the people, he possessed such a mastery of the tongue, such a comprehension of its power, such an ability to make it plastic for every end of language, as belonged to no other man of his time—to no other man since. His German style is the model of the scholar, and the idol of the people.

THE FIRST PROTESTANT VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.—ITS EARLY HISTORY.

The plan of a great human life is not something which the man makes; it is something which makes the man. The wide and full-formed plans which men make before they begin to act, are always failures. The achievements of the great masters in the moral revolutions of our race have invariably, at first, had the semblance of something fragmentary. The men themselves were not conscious of what their own work tended to. Could they have seen the full meaning of their own first acts, they would have shrunk back in dismay, pronouncing impossible those very things with the glorious consummation of which their names are now linked forever. So was it with Luther in the work of the Reformation. The plan of it was not in his mind when he began it. That plan in its vastness, difficulties and perils would have appalled him, had it been brought clearly before him. So was it also in regard to his greatest Reformatory labor: the translation of the Bible. At a period when he would have utterly denied his power to produce that very translation which the genius and learning of more than three centuries have failed to displace, he was actually unconsciously taking the first step toward its preparation. Like all great fabrics, Luther's translation was a growth.

The memorable year 1517, the year of the Theses, was also the year of Luther's first translation of part of the Holy Scriptures. It is earlier, however, than the Theses, or the con-

troversy with Tetzel, and yet its very preface implies the Protestant doctrine of the right of the illumined private judgment of Christians. It embraced only the SEVEN PENITENTIAL PSALMS,(VI., XXXII., XXXVIII., LI., CII., CXXX., CXLIII.) He used in its preparation the Latin translation of Jerome, and another by Reuchlin, which had appeared at Tübingen in 1512. In the Annotations, however, he frequently refers to the Hebrew.

Between 1518 and the appearance of his New Testament complete, in 1522, Luther translated eleven different portions of the Bible. In 1518 appeared two editions of a translation and exposition of the Lord's Prayer. The first edition was issued without Luther's consent, by Schneider, one of his pupils. Luther himself published the second edition, which deviates very much from the other; it appeared with this title: "Exposition, in German, of the Lord's Prayer, for the simple laity, by Doctor Martin Luther, Augustinian Monk, of Wittenberg. Not for the learned." The same year he translated the CX. Psalm. In 1519 appeared the Gospel for the Festival of St. Peter and St. Paul, and the Prayer of Manasseh. In 1520 he published his first Catechetical work, embracing the Ten Commandments.

In 1521 Luther was seized on his way from Worms to Wittenberg, and carried to the castle of the Wartburg, where he remained from May 4th, 1521, to March 6th of the following year. These months of calm, and of meditation, led to the maturing of his plans for the promotion of the Reformation, and among them, of the most important of the whole, the giving to the people the Word of God in their own tongue. Before his final leaving the Wartburg, Luther in disguise made his way to Wittenberg, and spent several days there, known only to a very few of his most trusted friends. During that mysterious and romantic visit, they may have urged upon him personally, this very work of translation. He had been urged to this work, indeed, before. "Melanchthon," says he, "constrained me to translate the New Testament." Various fragments of translation were published during the earlier part of Luther's sojourn

in his Patmos, but not until his return from Wittenberg did he begin the first grand portion of his translation of the Bible as a whole.

Luther translated the New Testament in the first draft in about three months. It sounds incredible, but the evidence places it beyond all doubt. He was only ten months at the Wartburg; during this period he wrote many other things; did a good deal of work on his Postills, and lost a great deal of time by sickness, and in other ways, and did not commence his New Testament until his sojourn was more than half over. Never did one of our race work with the ardor with which Luther wrought when his whole soul was engaged, and never, probably, was that great soul so engaged, so fired, so charmed with its occupation, as in this very work of translating the New Testament. The absurd idea that Luther was assisted in this first work by Melanchthon, Cruciger, Amsdorf, and others, has arisen from confounding with this a different work at a different period. In this, he was alone, far from the aid, far from the co-operating sympathy of a single friend.

He did not translate from the Vulgate, though he used that ancient and important translation with sound judgment. In his earlier efforts as a translator we see more of its influence than at a later period. This influence was partly, no doubt, unconscious. His thorough familiarity with the Vulgate would shape his translation to some extent, even when he was not thinking of it. But the Vulgate was of right the most important aid, next to the sacred text itself. Consequently, though Luther grew less and less dependent upon it, and saw more and more its defects, he never ceased to value it. He well knew, too, that many of the most serious faults of the received form of the Vulgate were the results of the corrupted text, the state of which before the critical labors which ran through the Sixteenth Century, was almost chaotic. We will give a few illustrations of the fact that in certain cases Luther followed the Vulgate, in his earliest translation, without warrant from the Greek text. We will distribute our illustrations under these heads: I. of *Additions;* II. of *Omissions;* III. of *Renderings;*

IV. of *Readings*, in which Luther follows the Vulgate when the Vulgate does not represent the Greek text—or at least that text to which alone Luther had access.

I.—ADDITIONS of the Vulgate and of Luther to the Erasmian Text. (1516, 1519.)

Mark vi. 2. Were astonished, Luther adds: Seiner Lehre: so Coverdale: at his learning.

" xvi. 9. Luther adds: Jesus.

" xii. 9. Luther adds: Alle: All the whole world: Cranmer.

1 John v. 12. He that hath the Son, Luther adds: Gottes —of God.

II.—OMISSIONS of the Vulgate and Luther from the Erasmian text. These are few, for the sins of the Vulgate against the pure text are most frequently those of *addition*.

Matth. i. 18. Omit: Jesus.

Matth. v. 22. Whosoever is angry with his brother, omit: without a cause.

Matth. vi. 4. Omit: himself.

III.—RENDERINGS in which the Vulgate and Luther depart from the Greek text.

Matth. x. 42. Little ones, Luther renders: one of the least. So Coverdale.

Mark xv. 4. Behold how many things they witness against thee, Luther renders: Wie hart sie dich verklagen. Coverdale: How sore they lay to thy charge.

1 Cor. xv. 44. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body, Luther renders: Hat man ein natürlichen Leib, so hat man auch einen geistlichen Leib. Coverdale: If there be a natural body, there is a spiritual body also.

1 Thess. i. 7. Renders: an example: Vulg.: ensample.

IV.—READINGS in which Luther follows the Vulgate.

Matth. iii. 8. For: fruits, Luther reads: fruit.

Matth. x. 25. For: Beelzeboul, reads: Beelzebub.
John xi. 54. For: Ephraim, reads: Ephrem.
Acts ix. 35. For: Saron, reads: Sarona.
Acts xiii. 6. For: Bar Jesus, reads: Bar Jehu.
Eph. iii. 3. For: he made known, reads: was made known.
Eph. v. 22. For: Wives submit yourselves, reads: Let the wives be subject to.
1 Tim. iii. 16. For: God was manifest in the flesh, Luther reads: Which was manifest in the flesh (in all the early editions.)
Heb. iv. 1. For: any of you, reads: any of us. So Tyndale and Coverdale.
Heb. ix. 14. For: your consciences, reads: our consciences.
Rev. xiv. 13. For: I heard the voice, reads: the voice which I heard.

A number of these adhesions to the Vulgate are to be traced to his judgment, that it here represented a purer text than that of Erasmus.*

To have rendered even the Vulgate into the noble German which Luther used would have been a great task. The very defects of the old German versions from the Vulgate which did not prevent their wide circulation, is a pathetic proof of the hungering of the people for the bread of life. But it was characteristic of Luther's originality, vigor, and clearness of perception, that he at once saw, what now seems so obvious, but which had not been seen for ages, that to give the people what they needed required more than a translation of a translation. If we remember that in our own day the general feeling is that the new translations to be prepared for the Bible Society, should be conformed to our English version, and not independent versions from the original, we have before us a fact which may help us, though very imperfectly, to realize how daring it seemed, in Luther's time, to prepare a translation for the people

* Palm: De Codicibus: quibus Lutherus usus est. Hamburg, 1735. Palm: Historie. Halle. 1772. p. 245.

from the original, involving, as it did, the idea that the Vulgate embalmed, as it was in the reverence of ages, was not in all respects a pure representation of the word of God. When Luther's translation appeared, there was no point which the Romanists made with more frequency, violence and effectiveness, than that it ignored the Vulgate when it departed from the Greek.

There is no decisive reason for thinking that Luther used any MANUSCRIPTS of the Greek text. The Greek texts which had been published, or at least printed, when Luther was engaged in his translation of the New Testament, were:—

1. The Complutensian, Folio, printed 1514; not published till 1523.
2. The first Erasmus. 1516. Folio.
3. The Aldine. 1518. Folio, follows for the most part the first Erasmus, even in its blunders, yet has some peculiarities worthy of note, as in James iv. 6.
4. The second Erasmus. 1519. Folio.
5. The Gerbelius, based on the Second Erasmus and the Aldine. 1521. 4to.
6. The third Erasmus. 1522. Folio.

It is evident that Luther's choice was confined at first to the Editions 2—5. The Complutensian and Erasmus 3 appeared too late for his earliest New Testament translation.

We might illustrate Luther's adherence to the Erasmian Greek text over against the Vulgate, I. in his *additions* from the Greek of what the Vulgate *omits*. II. in his *omissions*, following the Greek, of what the Vulgate *adds*. III. Of *readings* in which he does the same. IV. of *renderings* in which he forsakes the Vulgate for the Greek. The last head we defer for the present.

I.—*Additions* from the Greek, where the Vulgate omits.

Matt. ii. 18. *adds:* lamentation. Tyndale: mourning.
" vi. 4, 6, 18. *adds:* openly.
" vi. 13. *adds:* For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever.
So Coverdale. Tyndale *omits*.

Matt. vi. 14. *adds:* their trespasses.
" vi. 25. *adds:* or what ye shall drink.
" vi. 32. *adds:* heavenly.
Mark vi. 11. *adds:* Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable . . . . . city.

II.—*Omissions*, following the Greek, where the Vulgate *adds*.
Matt. vi. 15. *omits:* your trespasses.
" vi. 21. *omits:* he shall enter into the kingdom of the heavens.
" vii. 29. *omits:* their; and, Pharisees.
Mark xi. 26. *omits:* But if ye do not . . . trespasses.
Luke xvii. 36. *omits:* Two men shall be in the field . . . and the other left.
John xix. 38. *omits:* He came therefore and took the body of Jesus.
Jas. iv. 6. *omits:* Wherefore he saith, God resisteth . . . . the humble.
All the Editions of Erasmus and Gerbelius *omit* these words, but the Asulanus (Aldine) of 1518 *has* them, and so the Complutensian. Tyndale 1. Cov. *omit.*
1 John v. 7. *omits:* There are three that bear record . . . and the Holy Ghost.
This text Erasmus Ed. 1, 2, Asulanus, Gerbelius *omit.* Erasmus: Ed. 3–5 *has* it, though he did not believe it to be genuine. The Complutensian has it with slight variations. Luther rejected it on critical grounds, and it did not appear in any of his Bibles published in his lifetime. The Codex Amiatinus of the Vulgate omits it. Tyndale, has it, either from the Vulgate or Erasmus 3. Tynd. 2 and Cov. put it in brackets.
Rev. xii. 10. *omits:* the accuser of our brethren.
" xviii. 23. *omits:* and the light of a candle . . . thee.
" xix. 9. *omits:* the marriage.

III.—Of *Readings* in which he follows the Greek.

Matt. v. 4, 5. *reads* in order of Greek. Vulgate puts 5 first.

" v. 47. *reads:* publicans; Vulgate: heathen.

" vi. 1. *reads:* alms; Vulgate: righteousness.

" vi. 5. *reads:* thou prayest; Vulg.: ye pray.

Acts xiii. 33. *reads:* first Psalm, so Tynd., Cov.; Vulgate reads: second Psalm.

Rom. xv. 2. *reads:* Every one of us; Vulg.: of you.

Rev. ii. 13. *reads:* in my days; Vulg.: in those days.

" v. 12. *reads:* riches and wisdom; Vulg.: divinity and wisdom.

The most important peculiarities of Luther's first version, as we see by this minute examination, are solved at once by a comparison of it with the text of Erasmus. The differences in the four editions—two of them reprints of Erasmus—are not, for the most part, important; 2 and 3 may be considered as in the main one text, and 3 and 4 another. A minute examination seems to indicate that Luther had them all, and used them all; but the Second Erasmus seems, beyond all doubt, to have been his chief text, though the First Erasmus, and the Gerbelius, have both been urged by scholars for the post of honour.

Of the Aldine edition of Erasmus, 1518, there is a copy in fine condition in the City Library of Philadelphia. The author has all the later editions mentioned, except the first Erasmus and the Complutensian,* in his own Library. The admirable edition of the New Testament, by Van Ess,† gives all the various readings of Erasmus and the Complutensian, in the best form for comparison with each other and the Vulgate. Mill and Wetstein and Bengel also give these various readings, but not in so convenient a shape. The Complutensian readings are presented very fully also in Scrivener's Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament. (Cambridge, 1861.) Pp. 349–368.

* The writer has examined the Complutensian Polyglott in the Library of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, and the New Testament, formerly the property of Judge Jones of Philadelphia, now in the choice collection of Professor Charles Short of New York.

† Tübingen. 1827.

The same spirit which had impelled Luther to prepare this translation made him eager to have it as speedily as possible in the hands of the people. This desire, no less than the necessity of quelling the uproar and arresting the ruin, which the fanaticism of Carlstadt was bringing about, led to his flight from his prison, and his final return to Wittenberg. (March 14, 1522.) Here, in the house of Amsdorff, especially with the counsel and aid of Melanchthon, he revised his translation with great care.* He interested in the work his friend, Spalatin, the chaplain, librarian, and private secretary at the court; he solicited from him aid in suggesting apt words, "not words of the court or camp, but simple words—for this book wishes to be luminous in simplicity." He obtained through him, the privilege of an inspection of the Electoral jewels, that he might more accurately render the names of the gems in the twenty-first chapter of Revelation. They were sent to Luther, and returned by him through Cranach, the great painter.

After a thorough revision, Luther put his New Testament to press, urging on the work of printing with all his energies. Three presses were kept going, from which were thrown off ten thousand sheets daily. Luther complained of the slowness of the progress. The steam presses of our own day would hardly have worked rapidly enough for him. The first edition embraced probably three thousand copies, and appeared about September 21st, 1522. So eagerly was it received, that in December another edition came forth. It was hailed with delight, wherever the German tongue was used, and within three months of its appearance, an edition was issued at Basel by Petri. It woke a thrill of rapture everywhere among those who loved the Word of God. None received it more eagerly than the pious women of the time. The people and the evangelical part of the pastors vied with each other in the enthusiasm with which they greeted it: Lange, the Senior at Erfurt, had translated several of the books of the New Testament into German; when Luther's translation came into his hands, he at once used and cited it in

* March 30, 1522. Omnia nunc elimari (to polish) cepimus, *Philippus* et ego.

his preaching. Lifted by his noble evangelical spirit above the littleness of vanity, he was the first to give its true position in the Church to the work which forever consigned his own to oblivion.

There lie at our hand, as we write, three early imprints of these first editions. One is a Folio, dated 1523, and was printed by Hans Schönsperger, in the city of Augsburg. It was fitting that in that imperial city should early appear a work from which sprang the great Confession, which was destined to be set forth in its halls a few years later. The second is a Basel edition in Quarto, of 1523, with its pictures richly colored. The third was printed at Strasburg, in 1525, by John Knoblauch. All these editions have engravings. They are especially rich in pictures in the Book of Revelation, and there the artists have been allowed ample room for the play of their imaginations. The discolored pages, the antique type, the grotesque cuts, the strange devices of the printers, the binding of stamped hog-skin, the curious clasps, the arms of the old families, in whose libraries they once stood, gilt upon the sides or engraved on book-plates, the records in writing on margin and fly-leaf, made by men of different generations, nay, a kind of odor of the past, all these, as we handle these ancient books, carry the mind back to days long gone; to sore struggles whose blessings we enjoy; to the seed-time of weeping, whose harvest sheaves we bear in our bosom. In the heart of those times there comes before the vision, that immortal man to whom the world owes the emancipation of the Word, and its own redemption by that Word unbound. We see him bending over his work in the Wartburg. There are times when the text beneath his eyes fails to reveal to him the mind of the Spirit, and in the ardor of prayer he raises them to the Eternal Source of all illumination—and lifts them not in vain.

Well may we take the Bible in our hands, reverently and prayerfully, most of all because it was God who gave it to the Fathers. Well may we lift it tenderly and gratefully for the sake of martyrs and confessors, who toiled and died that it might be transmitted to us and to all time.

LUTHER'S VERSION; EARLY ENEMIES; HENRY VIII. AND GEORGE.

Amid the enthusiasm, with which Luther's translation of the New Testament was received, there were, of course, not wanting voices whose tones were by no means in unison with the general laudation. One of these growls of disapproval came from a very august source—from a gentleman portly in form, and charged by some who professed to know him well, with exhibiting a self-will of the largest kind. He is memorable in history for winning the title of "Defender of the Faith"—a faith which he afterward had his people burned to death for receiving in a part or so which interfered with his later discoveries. Bitterly disappointed, as he had been, in his matrimonial anticipations, he yet exhibited repeated evidences of what Dr. Johnson said was illustrated in all second marriages: "The triumph of hope over experience." He had entered into controversy with Luther, and had discovered that there was one man, at least, who was bold enough to "answer a fool according to his folly," although that fool might wear a crown. Not having it in his power to relieve his feelings in regard to Luther, in his favorite mode, which would have been to have had his head taken off, he relieved himself, as he best could, by venting his wrath in savage words, and in trying to rouse the enmity of others against the man he detested and feared. Henry the Eighth wrote, in January, 1523, to the Elector Frederick and to the Dukes John and George, of Saxony, as follows: "As I was about to seal this letter, I recollected that Luther, in the silly book which he put forth against me, excused himself from giving an answer on certain points, on the ground, that the work of translating the Bible left him no time for it. I have thought it well, therefore, to solicit your attention to this matter, so that he be not allowed to go on with this thing. I do not think it right, in general, that the Holy Scriptures should be read in the living tongues, and consider it specially perilous to read it in a translation by Luther. Any one can foresee, how unreliable he will be; he will corrupt the blessed Scriptures by his false interpretation, so that the common reader will

believe that he is drawing from the Holy Scriptures what that accursed man has derived from damnable heretical books." The German nobles, to whom this letter was addressed, received it in very different ways. Duke George replied, that he had bought up all the copies of Luther's translation which had found their way into his dominion, and had interdicted the circulation of it. The Elector Frederick and Duke John, in their reply, passed over this point with significant silence.

The mandate of Duke George spoke with special bitterness of the pictures in Luther's New Testament, pictures which it characterized as "outrageous, tending to throw scorn upon the Pope's holiness, and to confirm Luther's doctrine." Luther's comment, which he bestowed upon the Duke himself, was, "I am not to be frightened to death with a bladder:" and to inspire some of his own courage in others, he wrote his treatise "Of Civil Authority—how far we owe allegiance to it," in which he declares that rulers who suppress the Holy Scriptures are tyrants —murderers of Christ—worthy of a place with Herod, who sought the life of the infant Saviour.

THE COUNTER-TRANSLATION; EMSER.*

Jerome Emser managed to get himself involved in the amber of Luther's history; and so we know of him. After Duke George had entered on his crusade against Luther's New Testament, especially against the pictures in it, (and in this latter point, we confess, something might be urged for the duke, in an artistic point of view) he found his Peter the Hermit in a Catholic theologian, a native of Ulm, who had studied at Tübingen and Bale. He had been chaplain of Cardinal Raymond Gurk, which Gurk is, by interpretation, cucumber, and from him, if there be anything in a name, Emser may have derived some of his coolness, as he travelled with him through Germany and Italy. On his return, he obtained the chair of Belles Lettres at Erfurt. Subsequently, he became secretary and orator to Duke George. He was originally a friend of Luther,

* See Göz: Ueberblicke, etc., p. 300.

but his friendship was not permanent. It gave way at the Leipzig disputation, in 1519, and he transferred his allegiance to Eck. He had the honor of being the first literary antagonist of Luther's version. Duke George, the Bishop of Merseburg, Prince Adolphus of Anhalt, and the Bishop of Meissen, not satisfied with legal measures of suppression, called in Emser, to use the more formidable weapon, the pen, the gigantic power of which Luther was then exhibiting. About a year after the publication of the first edition of Luther's New Testament, Emser came forth with his confutation of it. Its title stated its object, which was, to show "On what ground, and for what reason, Luther's translation should be prohibited to the common people," and he claimed to have discovered in the unfortunate book about four errors and a quarter, more or less, to each page, some "fourteen hundred heresies and falsehoods," all told. Luther did not consider the work worthy of a reply; but Dr. Regius took up its defence, and confuted Emser in the robust manner which characterized that very hearty age. It seemed, however, as if Emser were about to illustrate his honesty in the very highest and rarest form in which a critic can commend himself to human confidence; it seemed as if he were about to prepare a book of the same general kind as that which he reviewed, in which he could be tested by his own canons, and his right to be severe on others demonstrated by the masterly hand with which he did the thing himself. He prepared to publish a counter-translation. He had the two qualities, in which many translators have found the sole proofs of their vocation; he could not write the language into which, and did not understand the language from which, he was to translate. But the coolness, possibly acquired from his friend, Cardinal Cucumber (alias Gurk,) stood him in better stead than all the knowledge he might have had of Greek and German. With little trouble, he produced a translation, equal, on the whole, as even Luther himself admitted, to Luther's own, and literally free from every objection which he had made to Luther's. We have had books on the Reformers, before the Reformation; on Lutheranism, before Luther, and such like; and another might

be written on the Yankees, before the sailing of the Mayflower. Emser was one of them.

The way he did the masterly thing we have mentioned was this:—He adopted, not stole (he was above stealing) he *adopted* Luther's translation bodily, only altering him where he had had the audacity to desert the Vulgate for the original. These alterations removed nearly all the fourteen hundred heresies at a sweep. But this was not enough. As the people looked at the "outrageous" pictures, not merely in spite of Duke George's prohibition, but with that zest, with which human nature always invests forbidden things, it was determined, not merely to have pictures, but the happy idea, which none but men nobly careless of their reputation for consistency would have harbored for a moment, was fallen on: the plan of having the very same ones. Duke George paid Cranach forty rix thalers for copies of them, and thus secured for himself the great satisfaction of seeing the book he had denounced, going forth in substance, and the pictures which he had specially assaulted, scattered everywhere, by his own ducal authority. In his preface, Emser has anticipated a style of thinking, which has crept into our Protestant churches. He says: "Let the layman only attend to having a holy life, rather than trouble himself about the Scriptures, which are only meant for the learned." We have had a good deal of nonsense ventilated in our churches in this country very much in the same vein. It means about this: be pious, be in earnest—never mind having ideas or doctrines—they only create divisions: be zealous about something, whether it be right or wrong. You may read your Bibles, but be careful not to form an opinion as to their meaning, or if you do, attach no importance to it, if any one does not agree with you. The English moralist was thought to go very far, when he said, "He can't be wrong, whose life is in the right;" but we have something beyond him and Emser; it is in effect, "he can't be wrong, whose sensations are of the right kind," and who gives himself up blindly to the right guidance, and takes the right newspaper.

Luther's New Testament, with Luther's pictures, thus adopted,

and with its margin crowded with Papistical notes, which were meant, as far as possible, to furnish the antidote to the text, went forth to the world. The preparation was made for a second edition of it. Duke George furnished for it a preface, in which, after exposing the enormities of Martin Luther, he characterized Emser as his dearly beloved, the worthy and erudite, and gave him a copyright for his work, which was to reach over the next two years. Poor Emser, suffocated in such a profusion of praises and privileges, died before he could enjoy any of them. His vanity was very great. One special token of it was, that he had his coat of arms engraved for the books he published. A copy of his New Testament lies before us, in which there figures, as a part of his crest, that goat's head, from which Luther, whose sense of the ludicrous was very active, derived his ordinary soubriquet for Emser, "the *goat*."

In his Treatise on Translation, Luther thus characterizes his opponent and his work: "We have seen this poor dealer in second-hand clothes, who has played the critic with my New Testament (I shall not mention his name again; he has gone to his judge—and every one, in fact, knows what he was,) who confesses that my German is pure and good, and who knew that he could not improve it, and yet wished to bring it to disgrace. He took my New Testament, almost word for word, as it came from my hand, removed my preface, notes, and name from it, added his name, his preface, and his notes to it, and thus sold my Testament under his own name. If any man doubts my word, he need but compare the two. Let him lay mine and the frippery man's side by side, and he will see who is the translator in both. If any man prefers the puddle to the spring, he need not take my work; only if he insist on being ignorant himself, let him allow others to learn. If any man can do the work better than I have done, let him not hide his talent in a napkin; let him come forth, and we will be the first to praise him. We claim no infallibility. We shall be thankful to those who point out our mistakes. Mistakes we have no doubt made, as Jerome often made them before us."

The New Testament, in common with the rest of the Scrip-

tures, yet with a pre-eminence among them, continued to be the object of Luther's repeated study up to the time of his death. The last revision of the translation of the whole Bible was commenced in 1541. The last edition printed under Luther's own eyes appeared in 1545. In February, 1556, he died.* The Exegetical Library—not to speak of the fathers, and of other indirect sources—had grown around him as he advanced. The Complutensian Polyglott (1514–17), and the editions of the New Testament which followed its text, had become accessible. Erasmus had carried his Greek New Testaments, with their translation and annotations, through five editions (1516–1535). The fifth remains to this hour the general basis of the received text. The Aldine of 1518 had been reprinted frequently. Colinæus had issued his exquisitely beautiful† Edition, Paris, 1534, which anticipated many of the readings fixed by modern criticism. Robert Stephens, the royal and regal printer, had issued the wonderfully accurate‡ Omirificam Edition of 1546, the text based upon the Complutensian, but with a collation of sixteen manuscripts. Great efforts, and not unsuccessful, had been made, especially by Robert Stephens, to emend the current and greatly corrupted text of the Vulgate (1528–1540). Flacius had issued his Clavis, the immortal Work in which he developed, as had never been done before, the principles of Hermeneutics (1537). Pagninus had done the same work from a relatively free Roman Catholic position, in his Introduction to Sacred Letters (1536). The Era of Luther was an Era of translations, in whose results there has been specific improvement in detached renderings, but no general advance whatever. Germany has produced no translation of the New Testament, equal, as a whole, to Luther's. Our authorized English version is but a revision of the work of Tyndale, to whom it owes all its generic excellencies and beauties. Among the Latin translators, Pagninus (1528) took a high rank, by his minute verbal accuracy, which caused his translation, in after times, to be used as an inter-

* See Panzer's Entwurf, pp. 370–376.

† Perquam nitida. Le Long. (Bœhmer-Masch.) I. 206.

‡ Nitidissima-duodecim sphalmata duntaxat accurunt. Le Long. I. 208.

linear. A Latin version of the New Testament appeared in 1529, with the imprint Wittenberg, an imprint which is probably spurious. It has been believed, by many scholars, to have been the work of Luther. Others attribute it to Melanchthon; but the authorship has never been settled. The Zürich translators, Leo Juda and his associates, had issued their Latin version, marked by great merits, not verbal, as Pagninus, but more in the reproductive manner of Luther, shedding light upon the meaning of the text (1543).

Luther's version had been followed by a number of rival or antagonistic translations in German, all of them freely using him—many of them, in fact, being substantially no more than a re-issue of Luther—with such variations as, they supposed, justified, sometimes, by the original, but yet more frequently by the Vulgate.

Zürich sent forth its version 1527; Hetzer and other fanatics sent forth theirs. The Romish theologians did Luther good service by the rigorous process, to which they subjected his translations in every way. To the labors of Emser (1527) were added those of Dietenberger, whose Bible appeared in 1534, (a compound of Emser's Recension of Luther's New Testament, of Luther's Old Testament, and of Leo Juda's Apocrypha, with corrections of the Hebrew and Greek from the Latin, and a body of notes), and of Eck, 1537. The gall of their severity was certainly sweetened by the unconscious flattery of their plagiarism—and whatever may have been the spirit, in which objections were made to his translations, Luther weighed them carefully, and wherever they had force, availed himself of them.

It was the age of inspiration to the translator, and the foundations of Biblical Versions, laid by its builders, will stand while the world stands. Luther had many and great competitors, in this era, for the highest glory in this grand work; but posterity accords him the rank of the greatest of Biblical translators. "His Bible," says Reuss,* "was, for its era, a miracle of science. Its style sounded as the prophecy of a golden age of

* Geschichte der Heiligen Schrift, N. T., § 47.

literature, and in masculine force, and in the unction of the Holy Spirit, it remains a yet unapproached model." For Luther may be claimed, that in the great edifice of the people's knowledge of God's Word, he laid the noblest stone, the corner-stone, in his translation of the New Testament. Future ages may, by their attrition, wear away the rougher points of its surface, but the massive substance will abide, the stone itself can never be displaced.

ART. III.—THE CHRISTOLOGIC PROBLEM.

BY REV. GEORGE N. ABBOTT, SOUTH NEWBURY, VERMONT.

IN Prof. Beyschlag's address at the German Evangelical Convention at Altenburg, in September, 1864, occurs the following passage:

"Christ's Godhead and manhood are not two kinds of factors for the first time to be put together; but they are in idea from eternity, and as a matter of fact in the historic life of Jesus, congruent and identical."*

In the month of August previous to the delivery of that address the writer of the following essay penned these sentences:

"I should use the term *theanthropic* or *divine-human* not simply in the sense of divine *plus* human, but of the *divine identified in the human*, and the *human identified in the divine*." *

* The discussion, here presented, of the mystery of the Person of Christ, explaining the orthodox doctrine, so as not to destroy in conception His true humanity, the very essential characteristic of which, the writer asserts, consists just in its *personality*, will commend itself as able and forcible to all who take the trouble to think on this difficult subject. It reaches substantially the same conclusion as *Lange*, in his view of the *Eternal God-man*. The subject is environed with great difficulties, and we are not prepared to assume any responsibility for the view advocated. Neither do we consider this necessary in a Review; which looks upon theology not as finished for our own use, but as the science which seeks more and more to grasp scientifically the substance of our faith, as this is found in the mystery of all mysteries, the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ.—EDITOR.

* * * "The PERSON of Christ, the central principle of his being, must be *idem humanum, idem divinum.*"*

These passages, written as they were almost if not exactly at the same time, yet in places so remote as Germany and America, and, at least on the part of the American writer, without the slightest knowledge at the time that a similar thought had ever found lodgment in another mind, are placed at the head of this article at the risk of their being partially misunderstood, for the sake of having some definite point of departure, as well as for the purpose of giving a sort of hint at the conclusion to be arrived at by a course of argument and illustration. It may be proper, therefore, to caution the reader against too hasty a conclusion with regard to the orthodoxy of the essay from this introduction, and to ask him to withhold judgment on that point till he has seen the limitations and modifications of a fuller view. Some sort of a prologue seems the more needful because the somewhat tortuous line of argument apparently necessary to so difficult a theme, may at times carry the reader out of sight of the main end. Let it be borne in mind, then, however indirect the course of thought at certain points, that the conception of the personal divine-human is the ultimate aim.

A great business of philosoply is to harmonize theory with facts. Philosophic theory is in its radical principles *ontological*, and hence has its ultimate ground outside the time-series; facts on the contrary lie in the time-series, and are hence historical in distinction from ontological. It is therefore important in theorizing upon any philosophic topic to distinguish between ontologic and historic views—between τὸ ὄν and τὸ γενόμενον. To make this distinction, however, and at the same time avoid divorcing the theory from the facts entirely, is a matter of no small difficulty; especially if the topic in question have any relation to ourselves. In relation to objective nature it is comparatively easy to assume a position outside the series of natural cause and effect, and while on the one hand we behold the

---

* It is not to be taken for granted, on account of the parallel here introduced, that the theories of the following article agree throughout with those of Prof. Beyschlag's Address.

panoramic series in its linked connection, at the same time to conceive of ground causes and ultimate designs distinct from what we behold.

Again it is not very difficult to see how our ontologic and empiric sciences of objective nature, mutually substantiate or invalidate each other. We may here, to be sure, make grave mistakes: we may find phenomena too under which we can put no rational ground-support for the present; but attention and contemplation are after all very potent of consistent results; and time is pretty sure to remedy the mistakes of the past.

But when we come home to ourselves, although the power of self-objectizing is the primary intellective power of personality, yet practically to set our empiric personal consciousness over against our ontologic personality, grounded in the pure reason, is for the average intellect no easy task. Hence an empiric psychology is a much easier achievement, than a rational psychology. It is a lighter thing to trace our personal history, than to search into those depths of our being where, properly speaking, no history transpires; although those same rational profundities furnish the prototypes of experience, in somewhat the same manner as geometry, the science of pure space, furnishes the prototypes of actual material forms.

Now to come directly to the subject proposed, there is the same difficulty involved in a rational Christology, that there is in a rational anthropology; since of course, the theanthropic Person who forms the subject of Christology, is possessed of proper humanity. A rational Christology should not, on the human side of the subject, be based purely on an empiric anthropology—an anthropology limited in its range, to the historic consciousness of actual human persons. A Christology having a no more ideal anthropologic basis, can only be an empiric Christology, at least on the human side. It may, to be sure, classify and characterize the phenomena in the life of Christ, distinguishing between the divine and human phases: it may indeed furnish many conceptions of the whole subject not only practically valuable, but really truthful, provided they be understood as conceptions from an empirical or historical

point of view. Suppose, for instance, we consider in a historic aspect the parentage of Christ, with its characteristic consequences. Here of course we may apply the same general principles of comparison between parent and offspring, that we do in the case of any man. In a child we commonly trace special resemblances to both parents: certain characteristics, both mental and physical, we ascribe to the father, and certain others to the mother. Sometimes, however, these differently derived characteristics are less distinct, so that we see apparently a single resultant instead of a double nature: sometimes too the resemblance bears very much more to one side than to the other, giving the impression, as it were, of a single parentage.

Now it will be admitted that these hereditary characteristics, whether distinct or blended, are manifested as *personal* characteristics in the child. They color and shape the whole personal history, thus giving evidence that they reach to the very bottom of the child's nature. Undoubtedly the soul entire is begotten and born with the body, of human parents, and bears the distinct marks of such birth. But while this is true on the one hand, it is also, according to the Preacher, true that at death "the spirit shall return to God *who gave it.*" Some indeed have interpreted this passage as meaning simply that God gives the individual human spirit or soul by traduction from a first created one; but Hengstenberg remarks that "the return of the individual soul to God can have its sufficient ground only in the fact that the individual soul has its origin immediately from God." This he considers to be the doctrine of the passage, on the point in question; while at the same time he intimates that it is but one side of the whole truth, traductionism also having its grounds of support, and suggests that the two *apparently* opposite theories of the soul's origin ought to be reconciled with each other.

While then, *historically* speaking, the man of the present time can trace his relationship to the great Creator only through a long line of ancestry, our common *ontological* relation to the "Father of our spirits" is most direct and immediate. The soul, then, viewed in relation to its divine origin, may be con-

ceived as simple—as having no more of a compound personality than had the first man's; but viewed in relation to its lineal human origin, it may be conceived as a compound—the fruit of manifold double procreations. Hence what appears simple in one view may appear complex in another, and *vice versa*.

Now in the case of Christ, who was historically the Son of God and of man, we should expect to see actions characteristic of both parents: we should expect to see a mingling of weakness and of power, of dependence and of self-sufficiency, of the ordinary and the miraculous. On this principle the acts and words of Christ have been classified, certain ones being assigned to his divine or paternal nature, and certain others to his human or maternal nature; while still others would seem to be products of the blended action of the two natures.

But the question is whether there may not be another point of view from which Christ's whole personal character can be seen as a rational unit. The very term *nature*, so often used in expressing the distinction and diversity just spoken of between the divine and the human is essentially *historic*. Even the divine nature of Christ, as belonging to the incarnation, had, according to the most orthodox conception, its birth with the human, and hence its historic development. But can we be satisfied with the notion that the Person of Christ is wholly bounded and limited within a historic or time series dating from the incarnation? If his divine-human personality as such, be conceived as absolutely coming into being at a certain *punctum temporis*, what else have we in the great Mediator than a really new Person—the consequence being that we have no longer the old Trinity, but a positively new one, as regards the Person who forms for us the special exponent of the divine (John i. 18)? In other words, if there be not some kind of ideal unity—or at least some point of ideal coincidence between the divine and the human, back of and independent of the historic union in the historic Christ, how can the historic union itself be regarded otherwise than as a monstrous metempsychosis on the part of the second Person of the Trinity? Again, as relates to the atonement, if there were in no possible sense an ante-historic, or rather *anti*-historic "Person of

Christ," what would be the significance of such time-honored poetic expressions as

"Rock of *ages* cleft for me,".

to say nothing of the Biblical figure of the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world?"

Indeed, we cannot rationally be satisfied with so narrow a view of the basis of our own personality as shall entirely exclude an anti-temporal element. How, on the hypothesis that our individual being is purely and absolutely a product of temporal events, could a philosopher, as such, establish the perpetuity of our identical existence? How, in other words, do we know that a pure product of time shall live eternally? Must there not at least be some rational entity or preconception to which our personality is directly related, in order to give to our personal existence a rational permanence—an imperishable constancy of self-identification? In fine, must not our personality be participant of the ὄν, as well as of the γενόμενον or φαινόμενον?

There are various forms under which this participation in the essentially true may be conceived. Perhaps we may venture the supposition, that the existence of an ideal counterpart to each genuine personality is the rational ground of the poetic conception of one's genius or guardian angel. Indeed, this ideal personality is the basis of the higher styles of art employed in the representation of persons. The true limner strives to make his picture truer than nature, by making it express something of the ideal character. Herein lies the superiority of a painted portrait over a photograph, which, at its greatest perfection, can represent only the historic character. How the ideal is related to the actual in this case may, perhaps, be faintly illustrated by reference to the laws of crystalline form, as compared with the realizations. Geometry enables us, entirely independently of any exact knowledge of the history of crystals, or of the special arrangement of their particles, to determine, with the utmost precision, the ideal form of any given crystal—a form, however, which, owing to the unequal

development of the different faces, is never realized fully in fact. The actual crystal is indeed sometimes almost a complete distortion of the ideal, and yet the ideal form is a certainty beyond all room for doubt—the *law* of formation being traceable amid the greatest apparent deviations.

But in the case of persons, owing to the existence of the voluntary power, the deviations from the ideal character may be still greater than in crystal-forms, and yet the rational root of personality be determinable by an ideal law; provided we had the same sort of a clew to the personal law which we have to the laws of crystals.

But, not to lay too much stress on one kind of illustration, let us take another—showing how an art practiced on empiric principles may be related to an ideal law not commonly recognized in practice. The succession of tones, natural to a musical voice, forms the empiric musical scale, on which is based all the music in the world. Practical musicians do not generally trouble themselves to know more of the reason why those particular tones are musically related, than the bare fact that they are spontaneously produced by the vocal organs, and are agreeable to the ear. But scientific demonstration has shown that all musical relations are dependent on the simple or combined ratios of certain numbers; and hence, an instrument can be constructed—not by the ear, but by rule and dividers—which shall give the musical tones and relations with more exactness than the finest ear can determine them. But besides these ideal correspondents to the musical tones actually produced by the human voice, the analogy of numbers goes to show that there is possible an indefinite range of musical relations, not represented in the scale in actual use—relations, however, which may possibly enter into the music of other rational beings, or of human beings in another state. The numerical ratios represented in actual music are, it may be remarked, the simplest, being limited, at least in all ordinary cases, to the first five numbers in the natural series, and to these in their simpler combinations. The radical idea, then, not only of music in general, but of the particular intervals,

from those of the coarsely graded diatonic scale down to those of the enharmonic scale of whatever grade, is to be sought in the relations of numbers: every tone has its relative place fixed, not by custom, not by conventional agreement, not by what *happens* to be human nature in this matter, but by a rational law, not a jot or tittle of variation from which is practicable without a corresponding loss of true musical character,

Now may it not be that each particular person, as well as the personal idea in general, bears some special and peculiar relation to the eternal principles of reason—a relation such as to give to the individual personality ideally an absolutely fixed position in the scale of being? In other words may not the ideal root of each true personality be a special function of the constituent principles of reason, and hence all the possible normal personalities have their mutual relationship fixed by an eternal law such as will permit neither disharmony nor confusion of any kind?

Of course, such an ideal law must be comprehensive at once of the entire range of normal personality: it must comprehend the divine and all orders of the angelic, no less than the human. The pure theory of rational personality, of whatever order, is thus brought down to a common basis, and that an absolute basis. The rational root of personality is in this view independent of the notion of pedigree, simple or compound. All modes of development or of realization are thrown out of the account, and we have left the simple rational idea of each possible person, as related to principles and to other possible persons.

It may, perhaps, be objected to such a view of the ideal basis of persons, that it appears to exclude freedom, all being fixed by an unalterable law. But it must be observed that fixedness is not opposed to freedom in the ideal world. What seems freer than music? What indeed is more like the very breath of freedom than its ethereal strains? Yet in the relative position of every tone there is the most rigid adherence to ideal laws. The same beautiful art may suggest too how that which rests in theory, upon ideal perfection may prove a failure in its actualization. Ever so noble a product of musical genius

upon paper may be spoiled in the execution: harmonies may be turned into discords, melodies into chaotic jargon, and so the conception of the composer fail entirely in the performance. In like manner we may imagine the grand rational harmony to be badly realized through the perverseness of the performers; —or, to change the figure to one founded on the original signification of the term *person* [persona], that great *drama* preconceived in the very essence of reason may be acted with more or less propriety—may even be partially, at least, falsified in the acting, without any change or possibility of change in the ideal parts to be performed. In other words, the rational roots of personalities may have the force and validity of rational first principles; while yet the actual persons, such especially as realize their existence through a process of development, may be more or less true to themselves.

There seems to me the greater need of explicitness on this point, because many even of those inclined to Platonic views of rational ideas do not appear to extend the function of reason beyond the mere furnishing of the so called abstract principles—principles, to be sure, which form the common substratum of personality, and which may, perhaps, be suggestive of personality in general, without being thus suggestive of persons in particular. If, on the contrary, universal reason is, so to speak, seminal of individual potences of personality, as well as of personality in general—if every normal root of personality is in effect a rational idea, then are the ontologic relations of persons of all classes to be sought on the rational side of their being, and not simply on the historical side.

An obvious consequence of the hypothesis now enunciated is that personality is essential to all rational beings, in that reason itself is personal to its very core. Not that reason is a person, or the historic origin of any person, but rather the universal prototype of the personal—the head-fountain of ideas and principles which can be realized and made valid only in persons, and which, hence, in so far as they tend to self-existence, tend also to the existence of those rational organisms through which they may assert themselves. Wherever, then, the principles of reason are realized, there in the

same measure is personality realized. It is moreover obvious that, according to what has been suggested, any species of being characterized as rational, cannot have personality eliminated from any parcel or portion of it. If humanity is rational it is also personal, and it is personal in just so far as it is rational or human. Every development of the human, necessarily implies in the same measure a development of the personal, the absolutely essential form of the human. Whatever is capable of becoming a human individual is capable of becoming a human person, and has within itself a determinate and unchangeable root of personality, which forms the idea and sole potentiating law of normal development for that individual.

Now just here is where it seems to me the old Christologic theory, or perhaps I should rather say the modern interpretation of it, fails. It supposes the existence of an impersonal human *nature*, a portion of which can be taken up and engrafted upon an already existing person of a higher order; the result being in name a "complex person," but in conception a mere complex individual in whom no proper personality of human origin need appear. This inconsistency really grows out of an attempt to account historically for that which requires, primarily at least, an ontologic explanation. One point is gained, however, by the theory which thus breaks down the human personality of Christ: the root of personality is admitted to be of necessity uncompounded. Here the true ontologic conception of a person prevails. Hooker comes very near—at least in word—to the ontologic truth, when he says that "in Christ there is no personal subsistence but one, and that from everlasting." The mistake lies in the assumption that this unity and eternity of personal subsistence in Christ necessarily involves the total exclusion of the human idea from the root of personality. There may have been ideal humanity just as much as there was actual Deity in this single personal subsistence from eternity. Indeed if the trinitarian second Person was ever to come into personal union with humanity, this union must have been anticipated in his ideal possession of all that is essential to humanity from the beginning:—otherwise his per-

sonality could not retain even its radical simplicity on the actual assumption of human nature. For, as there can be no such thing as a human soul which has not in it the potence of a special personality which must be developed in the development of the rational soul, if an absolutely and unconditionally *new* soul is incorporated into any person of whatever order, there is thereby incorporated a new personality, or at least the potence of one, which must become actual in just so far as the new soul becomes actual.

The only hypothesis by which this double personality in the case of Christ can be avoided seems to be that *the* humanity which the second Person of the Trinity eventually assumed historically existed in him in idea, or by some mode of rational prolepsis, from eternity.

In other words, if we suppose the divine idea and the human idea to have each a distinct form as such in reason, we must suppose *each idea to furnish a common radix*, on which can be based the conception of such a person as can normally become both the Son of God and the Son of man. We should on this hypothesis have what might be styled a divine-human or theanthropic root of personality. A real person who should form the living representative of this personal radical, would be a Theanthrope or God-man, not merely by an adventitious union of unassimilable elements or factors, but by the possession of an inherent personal principle, naturally asserting itself in two modes of existence.

Now if we cannot prove directly the hypothesis suggested, we may perhaps partially illustrate the notion of a double derivation of the same rational idea. Of course we shall more naturally look for such illustration in *a priori* science. We will take then the case of the square or second root of numbers. Observe first that so long as we cling to the strict idea of number, our required root will be a *second*, not a *square*, root—the word *square* being a geometrical term not applicable to numbers as such. The rule for the second root is also, strictly speaking, to be derived from generic arithmetic, that is from algebra, and is often so derived and demonstrated. But on the other hand,

precisely the same rule is deducible from the accretive construction of a geometrical square; and, as is well known, this mode of derivation, though not the most regular, is the one most common in elementary arithmetics, on account of its greater simplicity. Here then the idea of form or space and that of number or succession—two quite distinct ideas,—furnish yet the ground principle for the same rule; so that a demonstration is equally positive and certain, whether founded upon the one idea or the other. Imagine now one of these deductions to be much older than the other. Then there would be clearly two distinct historic origins of the same thing in principle. For a long period the rule would appear to have all its direct relations confined to the first parent science. But a new deduction would give it a new parentage, and would of course open up an entirely new set of practical relations, by which its scope and significance would be greatly enlarged.

For another illustration we may take the problem of giving to an algebraic function a maximum value, the method of solving which is usually deduced from the infinitesimal analysis. Indeed until comparatively lately this method was by the mathematicians of Europe and America, taken for granted to be, from the nature of the case, the only possible one of general application. But a certain Hindoo mathematician thought otherwise, and set himself the task of coming at the same result from purely algebraic data, independently of the infinitesimal analysis. To what extent he solved the problem I am not definitely aware; but the problem has been solved, so far at least as to make out the general algebraic condition of making a given function a maximum. The condition, however, deduced by this method is entirely different in its wording from the condition deduced from the principles of the infinitesimal analysis. Indeed there is no obvious connection between the two conditions grounded in two distinct conceptions, the one that of infinite division, the other that of the simple relations of finite quantities. But although the conditions are so different, and the start of operations under them apparently quite different, yet a very little progress in the two independent operations on the same

function generally brings to precisely the same equations; just as if there were but one method and one rule after all. In fact the two methods, though founded upon conceptions in one sense as wide apart as the poles, ultimately meet in many cases and become substantially one and the same.

Now although these illustrations strictly prove nothing with regard to the subject in hand, yet they do at least suggest the possibility that ideas as wide apart as the divine and human, may still have some representative in common. In view of such facts in the region of purely rational science, it may at least be regarded as a fair problem, whether there may not possibly be a person having an equally radical relation to both the divine and the human.

Again on the hypothesis that there may be a rational root of personality equally derivable from the human idea or from the divine, we may solve the problem of a historical divine-human Person, without admitting into our solution, either plainly or covertly, a mutilation of the one or the other nature. To say nothing of the Arian or any other historic mutilation on the divine side, we might on this hypothesis avoid the so called Nestorian heresy of attributing to Christ two personalities for the sake of saving the integrity of the human nature—as well as the Monarchian theory for preserving unity by conceiving a divine Person united with a human body—and the more subtile Apollinarian scheme of substituting for the human spirit the divine Logos, leaving only the human body and soul, the two lower strata of humanity, to represent the human in the complex Person. We might shun too the Eutychian error, which preserved the unity of personal consciousness along with a certain sort of integrity of both natures, by teaching a transmutation of the human nature into the divine.

Finally we might on the hypothesis proposed avoid the theory which, while it professes to eschew all the foregoing errors, really in a clandestine manner involves them all, by assuming on the one hand that the humanity of Christ is absolutely complete and entire, without at the same time recognizing the possibility of a human personality radically identical with a divine

one—and hence in fact assuming a double personality,—an absurdity which it escapes only by *decapitating the very idea of human nature*, in asserting that personality is not essential to it, and at all events in the case of Christ "can not be ascribed to it, and does not belong to it, any otherwise than as united to the Logos, the Word of God."

What, I ask, is the essential difference between this crushing out of the human personality of Christ and the Apollinarian substitution of the divine Logos in place of the human spirit—the whole man being composed of body, soul, and spirit? Is not the spirit in this view the special seat of personality? Or if we regard the spirit as equivalent to reason in the Coleridgean sense, is this reason at all available except in and through personality? What an absurdity would an impersonal rational being be! The cutting off of proper human personality can be nothing less than the cutting off *in effect* of proper human rationality.

With regard to the Apollinarian theory, Dr. Shedd very justly remarks that "If the rational part be subtracted from man, he becomes either an idiot or a brute. It is true that Apollinarism supplies the deficiency with the divine Reason; but it is no less true that at the instant of the union of the two natures, the human part is merely the body (σῶμα) with its vital principle (ψυχή). It is irrational, and God assumes into personal union with himself a merely brutal nature. The human factor, consequently, was defective in the Apollinarian Christology."

To this criticism on an ancient heresy, no doubt almost any reasonable theologian of the present day would render a most cordial assent; but is it not strange that the same error in substance, but thinly vailed by a different form of expression, should even now be held in the front ranks of orthodoxy, and that there should be men distinguished for theological acumen, who would express themselves in language like the following? "The Logos who is from eternity a trinitarian Person assumed into union with himself, not an *individualized* portion of the human nature, but an *un*individualized portion, and in the assumption individuated it. The eternal personality of the Logos

thus personalized the human 'nature' assumed in the miraculous conception."

Here we have apparently a completely personless humanity as such; but if we allow that the language used does not strictly exclude from the human nature the ordinary potence of individuality or personality, yet it can not imply less than that any existing tendency to development in this direction was wholly overruled and made subordinate, if not entirely nullified. There is left then, at the very best, only a stifled and suppressed personality on the human side. Where then were the human will —the substance of personality, and the fountain of every act of meritorious human virtue or obedience? Giving to the manhood in this view the largest available scope and completeness, it is but a passive entity—a sort of grown-up preinfanthood, wanting entirely the power either to act or to suffer from the impulse of self-determination. If such a style of manhood be not idiotic, it must be because of its intimate association with a superior guiding power in the personality of the divine Logos. Such humanity must be sinless, simply because of its incapacity to sin—its lack of moral agency.

Perhaps this view might be made clearer by retracing in brief the steps by which the position in question is arrived at. The Monarchian theory supposes only a human body united with the Logos—thus cutting off the human soul entirely. Apollinaris seeing this to be too great a mutilation, in accordance with the trichotomic theory subdivides the soul into soul and spirit, and cuts off the spirit to give place for the engrafting of the divine Logos. One step further brings us to the elimination or abstraction from the spirit, of personality; which being conceived, not as a constitutive, but rather as a sort of *modal* element of humanity, may be dispensed with in order to preserve the unity of person in the God-man. There is thus a seeming preservation of the, so to speak, *plastic material* of the man; while alas the man himself—the ego of manhood is obliterated;—or if, according to the view of some, not absolutely obliterated, at least so blended with and absorbed by a heterogeneous personality as to confound the human identity, and

hence to annul the power on the part of any really self-identifying personal *ego*, of asserting,—"*I* am the Son of *man*."

Whether the authors of the Chalcedon Symbol would have accepted this modern refinement of Apollinarism as an interpretation of their statement may possibly admit of some question. They seem to have aimed at a correct setting forth of the historic union of the divine and human elements, without either diminution or essential transformation of either. Their symbol was synthetic rather than analytic; asserting that in Christ the human and the divine concurred in a single person, instead of saying that Christ's personality was *ideally predetermined* to both a divine and a human mode of existence—the latter being realized as a fact in the incarnation. Indeed the synthetic forms of science generally precede the analytic, and are better suited to ordinary practical use. They more nearly coincide too with facts as such. But one special use of the analytic is to enable to reconstruct the synthetic more understandingly. In the case in hand, if the question were asked *how* could the human and divine natures become united in one proper person, the answer would be that, as the human nature concerned evolved into actuality its proper personality, this personality identified itself with that of the Logos—not because of any radical transformation in either, but because of a rational identity in the roots of personality from the divine and human sources. In other words, the conditions of personality in the divine and human natures—different as they are—like the two so widely different conditions of a maximum before mentioned, practically eventuated in this particular case, in an identical result, that is, in an undistinguishable self-consciousness, at once the normal representative of both natures, and of each in particular.

At some sort of a rational mesothet between the human and the divine Coleridge seems to have aimed, in the pregnant title "Productive Logos human and divine," to a proposed work designed as introductory to a commentary on the Gospel of St. John. That is, if there be any propriety in thus coupling the terms "human and divine" as joint epithets of the term

"Logos," then there must be such an entity as a human Logos bearing such a relation to the divine Logos as to make the same name proper for both. Whether we regard the two as essentially identical, or as being the opposite poles of each other, or as having some other relationship, we must certainly assume some kind of identity either in properties or products, in order to justify the common appellative. But whether this phraseology of Coleridge be justifiable or not, do not reason, philosophy, and revelation unite in testifying that Deity and humanity are so related as to be capable of the most intimate personal communion? And is it not a beautiful thought that this rational possibility of personal communion may be, nay that it is, itself impersonated in one who is at once a complete living exponent of both parties—an all-comprehensive living Word, at once utterance and response for each?

The foregoing argument having in many parts taken a form more illustrative than strictly logical, it may be well to present in succinct form the underlying logical argument: and that nothing may appear to be assumed as strictly proved which has not been subjected to a crucial test, all the premises in the argument may be set down as simple postulates. It is then postulated:

1. That in Christ is both true and proper Deity and true and proper humanity.

2. That Deity is essentially personal, and can manifest itself only in the form of a real person.

3. That humanity is likewise essentially personal, and can manifest itself only in the form of a real person—human *nature* conceived as apart from personality being as much an abstraction as goodness or virtue separated from its subject.

4. That neither divine nor human personality is rationally capable of transmutation.

5. That Jesus Christ is ontologically *one* person.

The conclusion is that the only hypothesis which can reconcile the foregoing postulates must be that the human personality in Christ and the divine personality in the same are rationally identical.

In view of the carefully chosen illustrations of a possible ideal radix of personality common to both the divine and human ideas, it will probably hardly be charged upon this essay, that it breaks down the grand distinction between the two. The fact that geometry and algebra may furnish each an independent demonstration of the same rule, is to no mathematical mind evidence that geometry is algebra, or algebra geometry. The two have their mesothetic points or principles, while yet they retain their eternal distinctness as wholes.

Indeed the most natural inference from the entire argument in this essay would be that only *one* divine-human personality is rationally conceivable; all other proper persons must be conceived as confined within their distinctive spheres.

On the other hand any theory which takes no account of ideal personal roots either human or divine—making all depend upon the arbitrary will of God and contingent historic development—can have no ground of rational certainty as to whether one or more theanthropic persons* may arise: all certainty on this score must hang wholly upon revelation, without a shadow of confirmation from reason.

The hypothesis offered, then, while it conceives a most perfect channel of communion between the divine and the human, through the one theanthropic Mediator, furnishes also a most substantial barrier against the deifying of humanity as well as the humanizing of Deity.

---

* Ancient mythology, it will be remembered, gives us a multitude of theanthropes.

ART. IV.—REPLY TO DR. DORNER'S CRITICISM OF "MERCERSBURG AND MODERN THEOLOGY COMPARED."*

BY REV. SAMUEL MILLER, POTTSVILLE, PA.

§ 1. THE conflict of the ages has been between Faith and Reason; or rather the conflict of Reason with itself in reference to its normal relation to Faith. Their supposed relation in the apprehension of the natural and the supernatural involved an irreconcilable difficulty. It took for granted, all along, that Faith had simply to do with an abstract supernatural world, while the Reason was supposed to be perfectly at home, and master of the situation in the sphere of the natural, without requiring the supporting and enlightening aid of Faith. This conception involved an irreconcilable dualism, which could only result in subordinating Faith to Reason, and in the end casting Faith overboard altogether, and the Church along with it, with the whole supernatural world into the bargain.

§ 2. But in trying to do without Faith the Reason made an important discovery. It found that its own foundation had given way, and that all its beautiful castles came tumbling down on its devoted head with a stunning blow. It saw that it could not afford to do without faith even in the order of nature. Human Reason, like everything else, needs a bottom to stand and start upon. It came to its proper senses when it learned, that its normal relation is to be subordinate to faith in all things, natural as well as supernatural. Nothing is more becoming and appropriate for human Reason than humbly to acknowledge, that in and of itself it knows nothing and can do nothing; and that all its scientific deductions are in truth the

* These articles were written whilst those of Dr. Nevin were in course of publication. We should have been gratified, if he had kindly relieved us of the no small undertaking to reply to so learned and able a divine as Professor Dorner, by going

results of principles and facts that are furnished by an authority higher than itself.

§ 3. Brought to a single point, the controversy in which we are engaged, refers to the simple question: *What is Faith?* It is important to all around that we should understand what we mean by the term in the premises.

If by Faith is meant the Reason, then say so; and cut the controversy short in favor of Rationalism and Nihilism, by casting Faith overboard altogether. If by Faith is meant mere assent to the deductions of Reason, then say that; but please do not call it Faith. In both cases the idea of Faith is wanting altogether.

§ 4. It is plain that by Faith something is meant, that is different and distinct from the Reason, or any of its deductions. It is evident, moreover, that we mean by it something that is higher, more general and comprehensive than the Reason, to which Reason stands subordinate. This implies, if it means anything, that Faith is *the* organ or faculty by which absolute certainty is reached in reference to anything. Reason can freely subordinate itself to a power that is higher than itself; but never to a co-ordinate power. If Faith and the Reason were faculties or organs that could separately reach first principles, there would never be peace between them while the world stands.

---

over the whole ground, including the fundamental issue between "D." and our book. That he did not do so, is not because he considers the issue of little importance, or a disinclination to enter fully into its discussion; but because the length to which his Answer had already extended, admonished him to bring his articles to a close. There is room, therefore, for a continuation of the discussion, without going over the same important ground already so ably discussed; but as bearing directly on that part or feature of the subject, which he says is of "fundamental account for this whole subject," and "in regard to which especially there is much which still challenges our consideration." Left to grapple with this issue, we are much encouraged at its close to find, that we are sustained by so profound a thinker as far as he has expressed himself; and to know that we have not mistaken our task, however imperfectly it has been performed. All we ask is a careful and thoughtful consideration of what we have to advance in defense of our position; for there is a practical significance involved in it—(to say nothing of its bearing on sacred science)—which it is our aim to bring out on the surface, that all may understand and be benefited.

§ 5. For this profound idea of Faith we are indebted to *Christology*. Faith in *Christ* has for its object at once the *natural* and *supernatural*, as comprehended in Him as the God-man; and in His whole life and history; in His Church; the Ministry; the Word; the Sacraments. We cannot separate the natural and supernatural in our Faith,—their ultimate subjective ground, as little as we can separate them in Him—their ultimate objective ground. The humanity of Christ is as much an object of Faith as His divinity. So through the whole of the Creed: the natural is ever made as much an object of Faith as the supernatural; the natural birth of Christ as well as His supernatural conception; His natural death and burial as well as His triumphant resurrection and ascension.

§ 6. What is thus united in Christ, and apprehended by Faith—the natural and supernatural—as it comes to its proper revelation in Him, does not fall asunder for Faith, as it lies outside of His immediate person in the world of nature and the world of grace. From Faith in Christ, the God-man, who is alike the true and proper embodiment of the supernatural and the natural, proceeds all true and sound philosophy, and all other sciences are true and certain only, as they are rooted and grounded in Faith. It is the Faith that apprehends Christ, which apprehends all other truths besides. No system of philosophy can ever satisfy the heart and mind, that does not with inward necessity refer *all truths*—natural as well as supernatural—to CHRIST AS THEIR ULTIMATE OBJECTIVE GROUND, the revelation of the absolute truth, and to Faith, as THEIR ULTIMATE SUBJECTIVE GROUND. It is here where the conflict of the ages between Faith and Reason ends, in the free and cheerful submission of Reason to Faith in all things, which is alone capable of furnishing the Reason with what is erroneously supposed to be immanent in the Reason itself, SELF-EVIDENT TRUTHS, or first principles.

§ 7. Indeed the Reason itself acknowledges the truth of this, in that it ever proceeds from *given* principles—presuppositions that are *apprehended* by Faith as infallibly sure, and *assented* to by the Reason, on which it depends for its deductions. Reason is strong and powerful, only as it rests on and is

continually supported by what is stronger than itself, Faith. *True* logic is ever consistent with Faith, from which it always starts, and in which it is rooted and grounded. Reason moves right, and is being led in the way of truth, natural and supernatural, only when it freely submits to be ruled by, and follows the unerring guidance of Faith, which leads into all truth.

There is no *blind* submission to *arbitrary* authority in the case, if you please. It is free, intelligent submission to legitimate and higher authority. That is the normal relation in which Reason stands to Faith.

Faith, as thus primarily related to Reason, is a power and faculty of the soul, the organ for the apprehension of the truth, in whatever form or manner it may authenticate itself as absolutely certain. If Faith cannot accept a thing as true, there is an end of it. Reason can do nothing with it. Logic can make nothing of it. Truth always enters by the door of Faith to reach the mind. Christ Himself enters by that door, and all other truths besides. Faith is the organ or faculty by which objective truth, *material* or *formal*, is apprehended and known, before it can be held and fixed in the mind in the form of real personal intelligence.

§ 8. Admitting that the WORK of Christ, in His redeeming power, authenticates Himself to our Faith as Redeemer, it is no less true, that He also speaks in His WORD, and authenticates His own voice and challenges our Faith in His *promises* of redemption, as the necessary condition precedent to its experience. This is the plain and simple evangelical doctrine of the Reformers and all Protestant Confessions. It is a "manufactured theory" (to borrow an expression from Dorner), that there can be no Faith or certainty of objective Christianity, that is not based on the conscious experience of its saving power. The Scriptures everywhere demand Faith in God's Word, and in His promises previous to their actual fulfilment. Such was the Faith of Abraham; such the Faith demanded by the Saviour in healing the sick and delivering men from the leprosy of sin: first Faith in Christ, then the experience of His healing and redeeming power. And such is the teaching

of evangelical theology all the world over, where it is taught in its original purity and simplicity.

§ 9. Thus much by way of introduction to the discussion, to which Professor Dorner's respectful and extended notice of our book invites us. He unfortunately takes a position, in reference to the theological discussion, in which our Church is engaged, and allows his criticism to be used, if not abused, for purposes equally unfortunate, that calls for a firm and decided resistance on the part of those, especially, whose productions were made the immediate occasion for his intervention. We shall confine our reply to his strictures on our book, to the leading and fundamental points of difference in our respective positions, without referring to his running missiles, which are too desultory to be noticed in detail, and would, besides, only tire the reader, to which we have a decided aversion. We shall be as short, pointed and clear as we can, or as the nature of the subject will allow.

I.

§ 10. Theology, however constructed, does not furnish men with either the necessary *Faith* or *brains* to apprehend it. It presupposes both as being at hand, when men approach the study of this sacred science, as the necessary condition of its apprehension after it is constructed. No account may be taken in the science itself or the preparation that goes before it, as the necessary condition to grasp and master the science itself. There is no contradiction but a most intimate relation subsisting between a sound Anthropology and a sound Theology. It is the Relation of Faith and Reason over again, as it comes to deal with the truth or objects of Faith in their scientific construction. While it is true, for instance, that the science which treats of the structure and functions of the eye, has properly nothing to do with the science that treats of the nature and properties of light, it is equally true, that without a light-perceiving eye, the light of the sun could not render visible the objects from which it proceeds.

§ 11. We can conceive the possibility even of making Christ the centre of theology, constructed in the strictest logical order

of the Creed, and be historical, churchly, sacramental, liturgical, and all that, and yet be approached and studied from wrong anthropological premises. The apprehension of it may be empirical only, and not by Faith, and thus its true force and meaning be entirely misapprehended. That is just the trouble with those, who judge and oppose Mercersburg theology, from the stand-point of the abstract understanding.

Our experience, in trying to make plain to the popular mind the difference between Mercersburg and Modern theology, has taught us the necessity to refer that difference to its last and ultimate subjective ground, *Faith*, in its widest and most general view, as distinguished from mere belief or the empirical, abstract understanding. And, in doing this, we think we have made plain to the popular mind, much that was not clearly understood, and corrected misapprehensions, without attempting to construct theology proper into a regular system of any kind.

§ 12. Dr. Nevin is undoubtedly correct when he says, that theology must be constructed on the logic of Faith in the order in which it comes to its expression in the Creed. But this truly important position does not imply, that such logical construction is in itself sufficient to authenticate the truth it enshrines, except as it enters into and is apprehended by subjective Faith. He means and has ever insisted, that we must come to stand in the truth, or be apprehended by it before we can apprehend it. His words and mode continually address themselves to our Faith, which he has a right to assume to be at hand before we begin to meddle with his writings, or with the subject at all. Modern theology, on the contrary, addresses itself, not to Faith, but directly to the abstract understanding. Not so Mercersburg theology.

It is not a theology for the abstract understanding, but primarily for Faith, and through Faith for the understanding, which, moving in the light of Faith, can find itself more really at home here than in modern theology, where the understanding is left to grope its way in the dark, or in its own light. This is precisely, to our mind, the great distinguishing feature of

Mercersburg theology, which we endeavored to present and keep constantly in view from beginning to end in our book.

§13. The only difference between Dr. Nevin's position and that of our book is, that he at once starts out with Christian Faith, from which he proceeds to reach the idea of Faith, in any of its more limited forms; while we take our position a step back of his, and proceed from the still more general idea of Faith, as this underlies and conditions Christian Faith itself.

§14. The fundamental difference between Mercersburg and Modern theology, as presented in our book, thus lies in their underlying Anthropology, which necessarily qualifies all the different points of doctrines based upon it. This is the fundamental and underlying tone of our whole book, to which the Christological and all other points of difference in the two systems are referred. This fact is not only apparent to the intelligent reader, but expressly stated on page 125, when, in speaking of Locke's empiricism, we say; "It meets us more or less clearly, at every point of contrast which we have instituted with that altogether different mode of thinking which underlies Mercersburg theology, from first to last."

The importance for the popular mind of thus contrasting the two systems from the most general principle of Faith, will become more apparent as we proceed in reply to Dr. Dorner's criticism.

§15. If we turn to Dr. Dorner's criticism, we find him at variance, both with Dr. Nevin and our book on this fundamental principle—*Faith*—something so simple in itself, that a child can exercise it, and yet so wonderfully mysterious in its nature and its relation to the two worlds of nature and of grace, that it has puzzled, and will continue to puzzle, the profoundest thinkers fully to comprehend and describe it. We need not wonder, therefore, that the great questions it involves have not yet been scientifically settled and put to rest.

§16. The gist of the whole question of Faith, as it is of every other question of principle, is, to determine in the first place what Faith is *in its most general* view, as it underlies all particular forms of Faith. Without this, we take it, no satis-

factory or scientific determination can be reached in reference to the particular nature of Christian Faith, or the still more particular nature of justifying Faith, or *personal Faith* in Christ as a Redeemer, on which Dorner, strangely enough, makes all certainty of objective truth depend. To his mind, or way of looking at the subject, all other forms of Faith, that are not based on such personal experience, ARE BUT A BLIND ACCEPTANCE OF ARBITRARY CHURCH AUTHORITY, WITHOUT BINDING FORCE ON THE CONSCIENCE AND CONDUCT OF MEN.

§ 17. This is the fundamental issue raised by Dr. Dorner, to which our attention will be mainly directed. It will be seen at a glance, that it involves the *whole Church question*, and the CONSCIENCE-BINDING question in particular, which has given so much offence in certain directions. Having raised that question and given it such prominence as to challenge attention, we will not evade it when it now comes to be tried by a fair and honorable criticism. It involves, for our mind, the whole matter in controversy; and if we fail to maintain our position on this point to the satisfaction of the reader, we will allow him to consider us defeated on the whole subject in debate. For if the Church and her ministry have no conscience-binding authority, that is not arbitrary, then they have no authority whatever; for we claim no *arbitrary authority* for the Church or anything else on *earth or in heaven.*

Dr. Dorner, as already intimated, not only rejects Dr. Nevin's Christological position, but our Anthropological position as well, touching the matter here at issue.

As against the *former*, he insists, that the general idea of Christian Faith (objective and subjective), depends on the particular idea of justifying Faith, or the personal experience of the saving power of Christ as Redeemer; and as against the *latter*, he makes the same particular idea of Faith or experience of redemption underlie certainty of objective truth in its widest view. The *same* objection lies against *both* positions alike.

Accordingly there can be no certainty reached, if Dorner's position is correct, in reference to any objective truth, until we have a distinct knowledge of Christ crucified, or personal experience of His redeeming power. And this personal Faith or

experience is of such supreme authority in matters of Faith and practice, that it is not only above the authority of the Church, but has a right to sit in judgment over the canonical Scriptures as well.

It will be seen, that this opens a wider range of argument than that which lies between Dorner and Nevin, and we have a legitimate right accordingly to bring in as evidence against Dorner's position, any other form or kind or degree of Faith that precedes justifying Faith or personal experience of salvation; provided such other forms or kinds of Faith imply *certainty of the objective truth in the case.*

§18. Thus, for instance, the question arises, as lying back of justifying Faith, yea, as lying back of Christianity, and back of Judaism itself, whether it is true, what the Apostle affirms, that the "Gentiles *knew* God, yet *did not glorify Him* as God?" Rom. i. 21.

Or is this a case in point where personal experience or "Evangelical" Faith has a right to correct the Holy Scriptures?

We think not. We think the Holy Scriptures will commend themselves to our Faith and judgment as of higher authority here, than that of any man's personal experience, which, if it is itself reliable, will be found to be subordinate to an authority higher than itself. Even on the supposition, that the truth here expressed by Paul admitted of a doubt, it cannot be seen how personal experience can put that doubt at rest.

Whatever may be said of the Old Testament saints as resting with a penitent Faith on the *promises* of *atonement* to be made by Christ, it is perfectly clear, that the Faith of the Gentiles had no such reference. And it is equally clear and admitted on all sides, that without the general Faith in God, they could never have been able to apprehend God as revealed in Christ—though, as Dr. Nevin has over and over stated, the Christian Faith would never be developed from this theocentric position alone; and, therefore, no system of Christian theology can be constructed upon the abstract idea or knowledge of God. Yet this does not invalidate in the least the position of the

Apostle that the Gentiles knew God, even his eternal power and Godhead.

§ 19. But the line of argument against Dr. Dorner's position, does not rest here. We carry it still farther, and say: If it is possible for the Gentiles to know God, and yet be morally estranged from Him, by not glorifying Him as God, *then men, by the light of a higher revelation, can know that Christ is the Son of God, and yet put Him to open shame.*

As God authenticates Himself objectively to the human spirit by the dim light of His revelation in nature, notwithstanding that men are at enmity with God; how much more are they confronted and confounded by His self-authenticating presence in the glorious works and person of Christ!

Did not Judas know whom he betrayed? Did not Peter know his Lord before he knew himself, a poor weeping and penitent sinner? Did not his confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (revealed to him not by flesh and blood), precede the ethical process of repentance, induced by the crowing of a cock, which sent the objective word and glance of Christ piercing through the inmost soul of the thrice guilty man? Did not His enemies, the Jews, know whom they despised and rejected? *Do not thousands of impenitent sinners know it*, and sin against better light and knowledge?

Pray, how do they know it? Are they sinning against *a blindly accepted authority of the Church?*

Is that all there is in sinning against Christ? Or in committing the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost? If so —then sinning against the authority of the Church must be a terrible damning sin after all?

Here comes to view, in a different aspect, the demoralizing effect of the wrong view of the doctrine of Justification by Faith, to which we referred in our recent articles on that subject;* a difficulty which Dorner's "Evangelical theology" has evidently not yet surmounted.

---

* See "Reformed Church Messenger," March, 1868. The Pharisees were blind as regards the essential, spiritual nature of Christ's mission, but not in regard to His divine commission. Hence He says to them: "If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see, therefore your sin remaineth."—JOHN ix. 41.

§ 20. The very possibility of sinning against Christ and despising Him implies, that the persons thus sinning, *know* what they are doing. They know that they are not rejecting an arbitrary doctrine of the Church, which they are expected to accept blindly. The light and knowledge against which they are sinning, does not merely rest on her testimony or a process of ratiocination, but on the *unmistakable voice of God* that speaks and reveals itself to them by the Holy Spirit through her as a higher order and constitution than mere nature; or, if you please, the bearer of God's self-authenticating message to them, whether they obey and repent or not. The appeal is not to their empirical understanding, or reason merely, but to the *imprisoned spirit*, including the ethical nature of man, which responds to the truth in spite of the bondage and law of sin under which it is held.

This, of course, is not what Dr. Dorner means to deny. He does not, he cannot possibly mean to say, that Christ did not authenticate Himself by His presence, His words and His works to many impenitent as well as penitent Jews; nor does he mean to deny, that the Gospel message, as proclaimed by the ministry of the Church, does not authenticate itself as divine to those who disobey as well as those who obey it. And yet his position clearly implies this, when he insists, not once or twice only, but through the whole of his criticism, both of Dr. Nevin and our book, that there can be no certainty of objective Christianity, that is not based on personal experience of its redeeming power. His position is clearly involved in an irreconcilable contradiction and confusion. It is the old dualism over again.

§ 21. Unless Christianity can authenticate itself objectively to the faith of the world, the world must inevitably sink into infidelity. This is the practical view of the subject, with which our theory must correspond. Certainty of objective Christianity does not necessarily imply certainty of one's own experience of its redeeming power. What the world needs to save it, is a Church and a Christianity, in which the world can have faith and confidence. If the world had no faith in objective Christianity, the world would have gone to perdition long since.

The burden of the Saviour's intercessory prayer was for the *union* and *perfection* of His *Church*, that the *world* might *believe* and *know*, that the Father had sent Him. John xvii. 21–23. For the Church is to be the light of the world; a city set on a hill, that cannot be hid. Matt. v. 14. The hope of the world hangs upon the faith and confidence, which the Church is capable of inspiring by the attributes that distinguish her as an objective, divine and supernatural institution in the world.

To yield the point here at issue would involve our theology still in the same inextricable contradiction and confusion, in which Dr. Dorner's position is clearly involved.

II.

§ 22. Let us not forget the point from which Mercersburg theology starts. From the very beginning, and at every stage of its progress—whether we start from its Christology or Anthropology—it rests on self-evident principles. Faith, at every stage of its progress, implies certainty of the object on which it is exercised. It takes nothing for granted. It is never, even in its incipient stage, a blind acceptance of arbitrary authority. It is this that gives Mercersburg theology its iron and invincible consistency for the logical mind; which neither bends nor breaks at a single point of attack, and enables us to smile sincerely at the charge—come from whence it may—that it claims for the Church or for anything *arbitrary* authority, or demands *blind* submission of any one—not even of our children in the nursery or the Sabbath-school, who learn to say, and with the saying learn to believe the Creed.

§ 23. When we speak of Faith as being psychologically of the same nature, whether its object is the natural or supernatural, we express a truism that should not be called into question under mistaken views that properly belong to supernaturalism and rationalism, which Dorner with us professes to have surmounted. It is Faith in its widest sense, as this can be exercised by all men, when confronted by the immediate or direct evidences of Christianity, or any other objective truth.

It is the Faith that underlies the moral sense, the whole of our

ethical as well as intellectual nature; it underlies all our sense and idea of God's justice and holiness, all sense of sin and guilt, of conviction, of awakening, of remorse, despair, as well as of evangelical repentance. Even the miserable, despairing wretch, that dies cursing God and all holy angels *knows*—yea, knows with a burning anguish—that God is a consuming fire, and how terrible it is to fall into the hands of the living God.

§ 24. When, however, our book speaks of Faith which apprehends the *deeper*, *inner*, *spiritual* sense of the Bible; or by which we are assured of being in a state of grace; or as the Christian self-consciousness; or as the apprehension of the witness of the Spirit to our spirit in reference to our immediate personal relation to Christ; or as the full assurance of Faith, it is evident that we are speaking of *Christian Faith*, or Faith in the restricted sense, in which only true and experienced *Christians* can exercise it.

This evident distinction is overlooked by Dr. Dorner, or rather he admits no such distinction. To his mind Faith is Faith only in the restricted sense in which it is justifying or "evangelical."

But in failing to see or admit the distinction referred to, he fails to see that his own and not our logic is at fault. For if his objection is to have any real force for his own mind, he must not take for granted the point in controversy, that certainty of objective Christianity cannot be reached by a Faith that is neither blind on the one hand, nor saving on the other. His mere arbitrary assumption, is, by his own showing, not of much account in matters where certainty of the truth is the subject of inquiry.

§ 25. Need we remind the readers of the Scriptures, that there are many kinds and degrees of Faith, that are not justifying Faith?

Does not the Devil believe and tremble? Did he not *know* Whom he tempted, and Whose Word he perverted? Does the serpent not *know* Whose heel is down upon his head? Did not the unclean spirits *know* Who came to cast them out and torment them before what they considered the proper time of doing it? Is there not a dead Faith, a Faith without works

of repentance? Or a mere temporary Faith? And what of the Faith of miracles, and the Faith without charity that can cast out devils and remove mountains, on the part of such of whom the Saviour will say, I never knew you? Is there no knowledge, no certainty implied in any of these? Do they not clearly imply something *more* than *a blind Faith on mere arbitrary authority?* And yet none of them is saving, justifying, evangelical Faith, which only those can exercise, who experience the redeeming power of Christ.*

§ 26. But even those who are predisposed to accept Christianity, or are friendly disposed towards it, have Faith, not mere belief, in its divine authority and authenticity, before they experience its redeeming and justifying power. The world as apprehended by Christianity, or as far as it stands under its divine and mystical power and influence, has a *certainty* of its truth, that is *more a good deal* than mere *blind assent to arbitrary authority* of any kind.

§ 27. To charge Christendom as having submitted for eighteen hundred years *blindly* to mere *arbitrary* church authority, is an insult to human nature. All church authority is, in Dorner's judgment, necessarily arbitrary, hierarchical and popish; but on what authority his sweeping assertion rests, does not appear. It is simply and purely assumed, as required by the position he occupies as a member of a Church, which is practically deprived of her legitimate authority by the despotism of the State.

§ 28. Legitimate authority becomes arbitrary only to brutish natures, in whom all sense of duty to society has died out, or in whom it has never been developed. The eternal principles of right, of truth and love are in the moral government of God *regulated by law*, and not left to be determined and disposed of simply by the individual conscience and judgment of men. *Society, whether as Church or State, is based on the recognition*

---

* See the remarkable instance recorded in Acts xix. 13–18, where the seven vagabond sons of Sceva, who tried to exorcise an evil spirit in the name of Jesus, whom Paul preached, were dumb-founded by the reply: "*Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?*"

of this principle; and we repeat, that it is an insult to human nature, to society, in whatever civilized form it may exist, to say that such abnegation is submission to *arbitrary* authority. Men know that it is not true. They know that in submitting to law and order, they comply as far as that goes with the principle of eternal right. In submitting their conscience freely and cheerfully to the laws and government of the Church, or the State, whichever it may be, they submit to what is based on and is regulative of Divine and eternal principles, in living conformity to which the freedom and happiness of man consist. This does not imply that either the Church or State has been supplied with a ready-made and perfect system of government, like an engine, or machine, which only requires a succession of *Popes or Kings*, to run it.

§ 29. A perfect system of government and laws, whether civil or ecclesiastical, consistent with those eternal principles in the proper adjustment of its legislative, executive and judicial departments, is the result of an *historical development*, which reaches back through all forms of government that have ever existed in the world. The *American People* have an idea, that the best and highest result of this historical development or experience of mankind, is being reached in the free institutions peculiar to our age and country—a system of government that seeks to exclude and guard against all idea of arbitrary authority in all its departments, and which has founded already an empire based upon such principles, which promises to be as great, as colossal and powerful as any that has ever existed in the world.

§ 30. The question which remains to be solved practically is, whether the *Church*, separated from the State, as it is in this country, is really a separate and independent institution in the world, capable of developing and maintaining an equally perfect system of Church government to regulate her own spiritual affairs, the right of which can only be maintained on the ground of the higher order of her constitution. Or is the *Church* a *nonentity*, without any real constitutional existence in the world, and consequently possessed of no divine authority separate from

the State? Is the State, after all, the only and the highest objective constitution in the world, that exists by divine right, (or the only form in which the eternal principles of *right*, of *truth*, and *love*, are projected and regulated), to which man owes allegiance, or to which he can submit his conscience and judgment?

§ 31. The question of *church authority*, it will thus be seen, lies back of all questions in regard to particular *forms of church government*, whether papal, episcopal, presbyterial or congregational. It is simply an impertinence, in the estimation of free Americans, to assume that church authority must necessarily assume the papal or hierarchical form. It is an impudent perversion, whether designedly or not, of the real question, when it is insisted, that Mercersburg is laboring to repristinate an hierarchical form of church government, when it labors to maintain for the Church the abstract right to govern itself under any form. The question of Ordination involves this fundamental question of divine authority in the Church, and has nothing whatever to do with the particular form, in which a perfect system of church government and laws in its legislative, executive, and judicial departments, including the rights and suffrage of the people, is to be reached. Before the *form* of church government can become a legitimate subject of inquiry, the right and authority to govern under any form must first be decided, and the ground upon which that right is based be felt and recognized. If such authority does not exist —if it is true, what Dorner says, that church authority is a dogmatic error—then a fig for church government under any form. Nothing is more crassly inconsistent than to deny church authority and yet practically cling to it like a drowning man, or in theory maintain it, and practically deny it. If the Church is no separate constitution in the world, invested with authority to govern itself, and yet requires to be governed and upheld for the good of society, who then is to govern the Church? The State of course. This is what Dorner means. Do his admirers mean the same thing?

§ 32. But the line of argument does not even rest here. It is here taken up by Dr. Nevin, who finds comprehended in the

Christocentric position in full all that has gone before in the way of preparation, and all that flows from it in the way of sequence. Whatever revelation may precede it, he here finds the whole universal truth comprehended in the person and work of Christ as it challenges our faith in the Creed. That faith, humble and submissive faith in the objects set forth in the Creed, is Christian faith, and comprehends all that faith can become in any of its more particular forms. As such it is more general and comprehensive than the idea of justifying faith in its restricted sense. It has its ground in the higher order of life, in which we come to stand by the *new birth*, of which holy Baptism is the sacramental sign and seal, as distinguished from *justification*, of which the holy Supper is the sign and seal. The normal type of the Christian life to which it refers, is the life of Christ; not that of Peter, Paul, Luther, Calvin, Jew or Gentile. But as Dr. Nevin in his Answer to Professor Dorner has done ample justice to the Christological view of the whole question, we will not enter into its discussion. We wish simply and briefly to refer to it, in concluding this article, as decisive on the particular point here brought under discussion.

§ 33. Our Christological position, as bearing on this point, may be briefly expressed thus: (based on Rom. i. 16.)

The Gospel of Christ is the experienced *power of God unto* personal *salvation to every one that believeth.* Some of the *Jews* believe; therefore *the Gospel of Christ is the* experienced *power of God unto* personal *salvation* to some of the *Jews.*

We think that is scripturally and logically correct. But it neither follows logically, nor is it a matter of fact, because believing *Jews* experienced the saving power of the Gospel, that THEREFORE it is *certain* that it is equally saving for the *Gentiles.* Peter's personal experience carried with it no such certainty of the universal redemptive power of the Gospel (nor did that of any other Apostle). That certainty rested for him on a special revelation, aside of his personal experience. What then becomes of Dorner's position, that the certainty of the general or objective nature and truth of Christianity can be in-

ferred from personal experience? The universal nature of the redemptive power of Christianity can be certified to our faith only by the objective constitution of Christianity itself, as it challenges our faith in the person and work of Christ, who assumed humanity and rendered satisfaction for it, in its universal sense. It is only in the light of this objective revelation of the universal significance of the Christian salvation that Paul was able to comprehend that such was its original design as involved in the promise given to Abraham, and from which he was enabled to apprehend and develop his great doctrine of justification by Faith, or Faith as the condition of salvation for every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. In establishing this doctrine of a standing or falling Church, he ever referred it to the great fundamental fact, that in the person of Christ there was neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision. *How infinitely removed was Paul from referring the certainty of this great and glorious truth to his own individual or personal experience! He could have done so only on the assumption that he comprehended the universal idea of humanity in his own person, instead of apprehending it by Faith as holding in the person of the Redeemer.*

III.

§ 34. But not only the *direct*, but even the *indirect* evidences of Christianity carry with them an authority to "bind the conscience of men in matters of faith and practice."

While it is true, that mere testimony, for instance, does not furnish *absolute* certainty, it yet furnishes a *reasonable* and *moral* certainty, as shown in chapter vi. of our book. Of this fact, Dr. Dorner, again, makes no account. It is not allowed to come to its right as bearing on the point in controversy.

§ 35. If the minister of the Gospel were nothing more than a *witness* of the truth—if he afforded nothing more than the indirect evidences of Christianity—his testimony is still binding on the consciences of men. It carries with it a reasonable and moral conviction, and the man who persistently acts contrary to such conviction of truth and duty, is justly condemned

by universal mankind as acting unreasonably and immorally. He is unanimously voted out of good society, and if formally excommunicated from the Church and treated as a publican, a sinner and a heathen, the act is sanctioned by the universal Church.

§ 36. The conviction in the case is not rational and moral blindness, by any means, because forsooth, the man who has nothing more than this, may still be in *spiritual* blindness—a blindness altogether of a different order, and in itself of various degrees, which no mere outward testimony or the clearest rational convictions can remove. Where this spiritual blindness begins to give way, there the light of *Faith* begins, as distinguished from mere *belief*. Though they often go together, and are intimately connected, yet *moral* and *spiritual* light or darkness must not be confounded, as though they were one and the same thing. The Jews, as a nation, for instance, were not in moral darkness as compared with the heathen; for unto them the moral law was given—but both Jews and Gentiles were in *spiritual* darkness, until "the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" came and shone into that spiritual darkness; at which the Jews were as much startled as the Gentiles, as something of a higher order altogether than anything they had ever witnessed before.

§ 37. Dr. Dorner charges our position as involving not only in favor of the Church and the Ministry as a whole, but for every individual minister, *infallibility* on the one hand, *and arbitrary, hierarchical and tyrannical power on the other.* This, he says, is necessarily and logically involved in the conscience-binding authority claimed in favor of a true minister of the Gospel. We deny the implication, and it will be our business to show, that not our but Dorner's own logic, is here again at fault. We think that we can show that such conscience-binding authority exists without being necessarily infallible on the one hand, or arbitrary and despotic on the other. On this issue we are again willing that our position shall stand or fall.

§ 38. Dr. Dorner overlooks the fact, that it is a *first principle* in ethics, that the reasonable testimony of evidence (if we

had nothing else to advance) carries with it authority to control the conscience of men, notwithstanding that it is liable to err. It has power to *bind* and *loosen* the conscience.

§ 39. A Jury, for instance, is in conscience *bound* to accept as true the *reasonable evidence* based on testimony, and find its verdict accordingly; and the conscience is *loosed* from all sense of responsibility in the possible case of error in judgment, in which even an innocent party may have been condemned and made to suffer. The fallibility of the authority in the case (reasonable evidence) does not vitiate its binding or loosing power on the conscience of the jury in the premises. Without being infallible on the one hand, or arbitrary, tyrannical or despotic on the other, its power to control and bind the conscience is nevertheless absolute and imperative, having the Divine sanction to back it, it being a fundamental principle of law in the moral government of God, that out of the mouth of two or three witnesses all things shall be established. To act contrary to it, or set it aside, is to set aside God's own authority, and to sin grievously against conscience itself. What is thus bound on earth is bound in heaven, and what is loosed on earth is loosed in heaven. It has the Divine sanction, and is approved by the moral sense of all mankind.

Here is the principle we are contending for. It is well understood by the American people, who are often called to act upon it in the capacity of Jurors in important civil and criminal cases, in which the life or fortune of a fellow-citizen is at stake. They know that their conscience is solemnly *bound* to bring in a verdict according to the objective facts and evidence in the case; and they know that only then, when they do this, is their conscience truly *free* from the sense of responsibility in the matter. To act otherwise would PERJURE them, and would be in the highest degree unjust, both morally and legally, and unfit them to be respected as members of society. To substitute one's private judgment, notions, fancies or prejudices in place of the law and the testimony in the case, would be universally execrated as infamous. But is it any better, we ask in all earnestness, to substitute in its place a fine spun ideal

istic speculation that would override and set at naught so plain and self-evident a principle?

We say this is the principle we are contending for. Let men make of it what they please, they cannot whittle it down to mean nothing, when applied to the Church and Ministry. Their testimony carries with it as much authority, to say the least of it, as any two or three respectable witnesses before a court of justice. It is a self-evident or first principle in ethics, which confronts us still, after all the sophistry and false philosophy which has been spent to explain it away or blunt its force. It will not be silent for being cried down as arbitrary, hierarchical and popish. To join in such a hue is unworthy of so able and profound a thinker as Dr. Dorner. The principle cannot be set aside in any such summary manner. It cannot be ignored, and no amount of learning can override it. It claims a right to be heard, and its claim is grounded in the moral sense of universal mankind. We claim for it a right to be heard in the solution of the question of ministerial and church authority.

§ 40. And in doing this, we plant ourselves squarely on Reformation ground—which assumes that *evangelical ministers*, whatever may be denied to Romish priests, are *true witnesses* of the truth and the redeeming power of Christ. How does Dr. Dorner come to dispute *their* authority on *Reformation* ground? Suppose the Romish Church has involved her testimony in such palpable contradiction, as to invalidate her testimony altogether, how is it about the Reformation? Is that not any better? Did not the Reformation surmount those contradictions and place the evidences of Christianity on a surer foundation? Is not the Reformation, with its material and formal principle —justification by Faith and the normative authority of the Scriptures—*a witness* still for the truth? And are not all evangelical ministers, whose testimony accords with that principle, representatives and witnesses to the truth? And if truthful and credible witnesses, does not their testimony carry with it for the Protestant mind at least, all the binding force and authority which is claimed for the principle for which we are contending?

§ 41. To deny that the testimony of Reformed ministers carries with it a binding authority for the conscience of her children, implies that they are false witnesses, or at least unreliable. It is saying that they are certifying about something whereof they have no knowledge themselves, and are therefore unfit to fill the sacred office. How ministers can join in declaring themselves thus unfit for the office, and yet remain in it, involves a sad contradiction truly. No wonder, that the people take them at their word. The sooner such a man gets down from the witness-stand, to make room for such who know whereof they affirm, the better it will be. No jury can sit patiently and listen to a man's talk, who confesses or implicates himself in the outset, that he knows nothing about what he is talking. His talk, of course, carries no authority and conviction for the judgment and conscience of his hearers. He can go. But do not, for pity's sake, call such a man a Minister of the Gospel. His ordination, we confess, was a sad mistake, and should be recalled. We do not claim infallibility for the Church, which is thus liable to err oftentimes in placing men in positions which they are unfit to occupy, they themselves being the judges.

§ 42. But a minister of the Gospel is more than a mere witness of the truth. His ministerial *acts* are no less binding on the conscience of men. Both his testimony, and his official acts carry with them an objective force and authority, which binds and loosens the conscience. Whatever may be said to guard against a misapprehension of the power of the keys, the least that can be said in their favor is, that they are of objective force to bind and loosen the conscience of men, and that this power is legitimately exercised by the executive department of the Church. Official acts of an executive officer are objective acts, and are the acts of God and the whole Church. The act of baptism is as valid and binding on the conscience of the subject, as if Christ Himself performed it, or as if the whole Church were present to sanction the act. So are all other ministerial acts. What is thus bound on earth is bound in heaven. And yet, as in the case of testimony, it does not imply infallibility on the one hand, nor arbitrary, despotic pow-

er on the other. A minister does not baptize, confirm or marry people against their free consent. Nor can he, on the other hand, see into their hearts and be infallibly sure of the reasonable and moral evidences that justify him in performing the solemn acts. These things neither confer nor vitiate his authority in the premises. That inheres in him in virtue of his office.

§ 43. The power here spoken of, ministerial authority, becomes arbitrary only when it is *abused;* but, and just as far as it is abused, does it cease to be legitimate and of binding force. The Presbyterian Church does not authorize any of her ordained ministers to teach Unitarian doctrines, nor is a Reformed minister authorized to *lord* it over the conscience of the people. We confess, that we hardly know what to think of a man, who cannot see the broad distinction which exists between legitimate and arbitrary authority. If the evangelical theology of Germany proclaims the doctrine that authority must necessarily be arbitrary and despotic, then we cannot see why Radicalism should not one of these days upset the whole rotten system that rests on such a foundation.

§ 44. That there is and always has been danger under all forms of government, that legitimate authority may be sadly abused, and thus become arbitrary, despotic and tyrannical, becoming unjust in either or all its several departments, is only too true. This is owing partly to human imperfection and partly and perhaps mainly to the innate selfishness or lust of power in man. The only way to guard against this is, not by rejecting *legitimate* authority either as it holds in men individually or collectively, but by placing it on a *sure and firm foundation*, and *perfecting such a just and liberal system of constitutional government, that will place its internal and harmonious workings beyond the control and disturbing influences of arbitrary will.*

§ 45. The practical realization of such a church organization is involved in the great Church Question, and any one who contributes towards its attainment is working in the right direction. Mercersburg does not here stand alone, though it stands nearest to the heart of this great question, by reminding us of

the great truth, *that no other foundation can be laid than that which is laid, Jesus Christ.* It is here where the German Reformed Church has firmly planted her foot, and God helping her, will never swerve from it.

IV.

§ 46. But let us now enter into consideration of what Dr. Dorner prizes above all other things, *personal experience;* which he considers as of *supreme* authority in matters of faith and practice, as well as in the construction of a satisfactory system of theology. We do this the more readily because it is assumed, that Mercersburg is opposed to experimental religion and makes no account of it because, forsooth, it refuses to make it of supreme authority. This charge is boldly made and reiterated by our opponents, and it is broadly intimated by Dorner, that at least our theology excludes the idea, or makes little or no account of it.

Dr. Nevin's Answer, if not our book, should undeceive Dorner's mind on this subject. But it may be well to refer to it again with special reference to the question, whether personal experience and the Scriptures, in whatever relation they may stand, are in and of themselves, the only and exclusive basis, on which a satisfactory system of theology can be constructed. As the appeal lies to personal experience, as the only authority which Dorner recognizes, we are willing that the case shall be tried before that tribunal.

§ 47. When we commenced to study theology, we brought to it what Professor Dorner so highly prizes. Our Christian faith and knowledge began emphatically by what is called experimental religion. Not until the love of God was shed abroad in our penitent heart in the silent chamber of a poor but pious mother's home, with joy unspeakable and full of glory, did we know with certainty that our sins were pardoned, and that we had a saving interest in Christ as the Redeemer. And only then did the Holy Scriptures pour a new flood of light in upon us, as it never did before; a new revelation as it were of the deeper, inner, spiritual sense of the Holy Bible, to which our heart could joyfully respond.

§ 48. But when we commenced to read other books—why was it, that our heart could not thus joyfully respond to the truth as articulated in what is styled a system of theology? Why did we ever turn away from the dry and lifeless skeleton of dogmatics and turn involuntarily and instinctively to the fresh fountain of life and light as we found it gushing forth in the Sacred Scriptures? This became for us a serious question, when subsequently we came to think earnestly about it. We could not understand it. Surely, a theology that is truly Scriptural, must challenge our Faith with as joyful and hearty a response as the Scriptures themselves.

Here, in our case, experience and the Scriptures were in harmony. There existed no uncertainty in reference to the reality of the one or the truth of the other. But we could not construct from these alone a harmonious or satisfactory theology; *nor could we find it elsewhere.* We asked ourselves, why is this? Why cannot men, whose *experience* is in harmony with the *Scriptures*, produce a *theology* that is in harmony with both?

The thing troubled us. It was perplexing. We consulted older and wiser heads than our own. They told us substantially what Dr. Dorner tells us, that out of these two factors, experience and the Scriptures, a fully rounded and satisfactory system of theology must and can be constructed. But, thought we, why does not somebody do it? What is wrong in theology? What is wanted?

§ 49. Not until we got hold of Mercersburg theology did we find an answer to the question that so seriously perplexed us. Theology wanted *life.* It needed a *third* principle to enter into its structure—*the life of Christ.* The life of Christ as this underlies both experience and the Scriptures. It must be Christological. This new principle brings theology into harmony with experience and the Scriptures.

When the new idea flashed upon our mind for the first time, in listening to Dr. Schaff's memorable Inaugural Address over twenty years ago in the city of Reading, a new and joyful hope was born in our heart for the German Reformed Church, and indeed for the whole Protestant Church. We found in

it the ground of our own joyful experience, which was thenceforward in harmony with our theology as well as the Scriptures. By the inspiration of that great idea, we foresaw at once the great struggle that awaited the Church, and the triumph that would crown it all.

§ 50. Dorner says: "Miller, like Nevin, makes all depend on receiving the *life* of Christ." Just so. It is the Kern and Stern, as Dr. Schaff once wrote to us, of all sound experience and theology. Theology is brought into harmony with experience and the Scriptures, and becomes itself a living power.

By the new creating power of this life, the articulated bones of a dead theology are again clothed with flesh and blood and made a living, moving, stirring thing in the world, with a new pulsating heart in its bosom, and a new tongue in its head, with eyes and ears wide open to the world's movement all around it.

Christianity is not a corpse, galvanized into life, whether in the form of religion, the Scriptures or a sound theology. It is the life of Christ that must pervade them inherently, from which they proceed as their proper ground, and brings them into harmony. Without it we should have the dead bones of the Prophets, Apostles, Fathers and Reformers, but not the life that animated them and their writings. Separate the life of Christ from experience, the Scriptures, theology, or practical activity of any sort, and what have you but the spasmodic effects of factitious efforts to set and keep alive and in motion a lifeless corpse?

§ 51. Yes, Mercersburg "makes all depend on receiving the life of Christ." But instead of being a matter of *reproach*, it is the *glory* of Mercersburg theology, to which every truly experienced and pious heart will joyfully respond. In it the experienced Christian finds what he has been looking for, a theology to which his heart can respond, and that is in unison with his holiest experience and the sacred Scriptures. Thanks to Dorner for thus appealing the question to experience. Let it go home to the single-hearted consciousness of every *truly* converted soul, and in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases in a

thousand, Dorner would hear the response: "Yes, blessed be the Lord, I have found Christ Jesus, the life of my life, the hope and joy of my soul, and through Him deliverance from my load of sins." CHRIST FIRST, ALWAYS, AND ONLY AS CONSCIOUSLY JOINED WITH HIM, THE SENSE OF DELIVERANCE FROM SIN. This is experimental religion as taught by Dr. Nevin, and as it will be recognized by all evangelical Christians in America. How is it in Germany?

§ 52. This leads us to enter a little deeper into the subject and to present it in a light, in which it is but little understood, we are afraid, on both sides of the Atlantic, and which must be taken into account, in order to understand and appreciate the true position of Mercersburg theology as against the charge of Dorner and others, that it seems to make little or no account of experience.

Much of our American Christianity is of an *abnormal* character, and the inward struggle and experience are generally in the reverse order of what they are among our good brethren in Germany. There the *mental* struggle precedes the *heart* struggle. Here the *heart* struggle (awakening, repentance and conversion) generally precedes the *mental* struggle. Let us explain.

§ 53. Thousands of our American people are allowed to grow up outside of the Church, like heathens (on the principle that nobody should belong to the Church until he is converted), and are awakened and converted on the anxious-bench system, by missionary and revival efforts, *without any previous doctrinal instruction*, which, if at all, *follows afterwards*. In Germany, on the contrary, and in the Old School generally, there and elsewhere, the doctrinal instruction and consequent mental struggle is made to *precede* the ethical process of repentance and experience, if it happily comes to that.

§ 54. Now, the position of Mercersburg is, that *both* these processes are *abnormal*. Neither of them is the truly normal process by which Christianity or the life of Christ seeks to develop itself. Both HEART and MIND should be made the subject of Christian nurture at the SAME TIME, and as early in life as possible. This is educational religion.

It will be seen at a glance, that EXPERIENCE, in such normal cases, is something very different from what it necessarily must be in both the abnormal cases referred to; and we would remind Dr. Dorner, that our theology is based on experience, as one of its factors no less than his "Evangelical Theology;" but it is based on the *normal* and not on any abnormal experience.

§ 55. If any one chooses to make Methodistic or Pietistic experience, the basis of his theology, let him do so; but it does not suit the German Reformed Church in America, and never did, to make it the basis of her theology. Nor is she willing, on the other hand, to be satisfied with the dry and bony system of abstract doctrines, which simply address themselves to the understanding.

§ 56. Our American Reformed theology, as we have it in our Catechism, as this is based on the Creed and taught at Mercersburg, assumes throughout, that the Christian life is sacramentally communicated in holy Baptism, and that its development properly begins in childhood (to which latter proposition even the opponents of Mercersburg give their assent), by a system of Christian nurture in the family, the school and the Church, by which the *heart* as well as the *mind* (the *ethical* as well as the *intellectual* nature) of the baptized members of the Church are at once brought under the saving power of the Gospel, and that the knowledge and certainty thus reached is not the result of a one-sided intellectualistic process, as little as it is that of a one-sided experimentalism.

§ 57. Mercersburg does not denounce and never has denounced as necessarily false and fanatical the abnormal experience that precedes proper religious instruction in the doctrines of Christianity; but it refuses to make such abnormal experience *the* basis of its theology—for the very good reason, as we have already seen, that theology cannot be constructed on such mere experience. As soon as such abnormal piety begins to think, it begins to get into trouble—the mental struggle begins—and, if not piloted and guided by the instruction and superior wisdom of the Church, will run itself into all sorts of extrava-

gance. Left to itself and the Scriptures alone, guided by private judgment, it has made strange havoc of evangelical theology itself, by setting Luther completely on his head, even in reference to the material principle of Protestantism, to say nothing of other fantastic performances in the name of Evangelical Protestantism.

§ 58. With Wesley's doctrine of *perfection*, for instance, how could Luther have ever reached and established the doctrine of justification by Faith alone, as the doctrine of a standing or falling Church? And yet many experienced Christians in England and America accept, in all soberness, both Wesley's doctrine of perfection and Luther's doctrine of justification, without perceiving their contradiction. Both are accepted and held as sound and evangelical—the fundamental error of Rome, and the material principle of Protestantism!

§ 59. What criterion or authority then does (Dorner's) personal experience and piety, in connection with the Scriptures alone, afford in the construction of a satisfactory system of theology? If we accept Luther's views in preference to Wesley's, on the score of superior intelligence or insight in the Holy Scriptures, or any other ground, then it is no longer experience and the Scriptures alone, on which theology is based. A third factor is admitted as *decisive* authority; and the question recurs, what is that third factor? Is it Luther's private judgment, or what?

§ 60. As against Wesley's aberration from evangelical doctrine, the *universal Faith* of the Protestant Church outside of Wesleyanism, is clearly of decisive authority. It rests here and nowhere else. It is church authority, legitimately expressed and brought home to our Faith and conviction, that is decisive in the case. If this may be set aside and ignored—if church authority has no binding power on the conscience and judgment of men, what remedy then remains to save the Church from endless division, both theoretically and practically? This leads us, in conclusion, to consider *Dorner's* Remedy for sectarianism. It is decidedly unique.

V.

§ 61. We say, this leads us, in conclusion, to consider what Dorner proposes in place of church authority and as the remedy against sectarianism. After laboring hard through the whole of his article, to prove that church authority is a dogmatic error; that it is an assumption of arbitrary, hierarchical and despotic power; that the Church is not the body of Christ; that she and her ministry have no authority whatever to bind the conscience of men—it is but reasonable to expect, that, in place of church authority, Professor Dorner would be able to propose something better and more effectual, that might conserve the union of the Church and save her from disintegration. But alas! these expectations come to a sad disappointment. His remedy for sectarianism reminds us of the last remedy, which a physician offers a dying patient, whom he considers beyond hope of recovery. Dorner has no faith in the Church. He does not believe, that she is a separate institution in the world, with the right of self-government. Left to herself, without the strong arm of the State to govern her, he has simply no faith in her ability to save herself from disintegration, and, no doubt, honestly believes, that the reaction in favor of church authority will only tend to increase American sects. Hence he says: "The only help is, to use the means of grace, the ethical side in the idea of the Church, the duty of love, faithfulness, patience, humility; these will best prevail against loose sectarianism."

§ 62. We think Dr. Dorner entirely mistakes the cause as well as the remedy of American sectarianism. He mistakes the temper of our American Churches, if he thinks that the reaction in favor of *legitimate* church authority will cause any serious division in the Church. We have far more reason to believe, that the reaction, if wisely conducted, will be hailed by all our evangelical denominations, who are awake to the important work which the American Churches have to perform in the conversion and Christianization of the millions, who are coming to make up the ever increasing population of this great and growing country.

§ 63. The cause of sectarianism is not so much the want of subjective piety, as Dorner seems to think, as the want of faith in and a proper conception of the idea of the Church. Whatever sins may lie at the door, as the immediate cause of the manifold divisions of the body of Christ; and whatever reason may exist that we should all humbly confess our sins, the fact itself stands out in clear and bold relief, that the real and remote cause of sectarianism is the want of Faith in and a proper conception of the idea of the Church, as a divinely appointed institution, invested with truly legitimate and maternal authority, to which it is the sacred duty of her children to submit in the Lord. Mere subjective piety, either on the part of the sects or the Church, is not of itself sufficient to restore this faith and heal our divisions. It does not even unite the sects themselves. They are just as much divided and at outs among themselves, with all their boasted subjective piety. The remedy proposed by Dorner is, therefore, not of itself the remedy that is required to unite them. Let us give a simple illustration, that will place this in the clearest light.

§ 64. Dorner's remedy reminds us of our Lancaster county German sects, whom it emphatically "suffices to use the means of grace, the ethical side of the idea of the Church, the duty of love, faithfulness, patience, humility." But has this pious subjectivism of our isolated Dunkard and Mennonite sects ever prevailed to bring them a single step nearer to the great body of Christians, or induced them to contribute out of the abundance of their accumulated wealth a single dollar towards the conversion of the world lying outside of their own immediate farms? Not a bit of it. Not the first sign of it.

Here, as in the case of theology, mere subjective experience and piety, with nothing but the Bible and private judgment, do not suffice to unite Christians. The sense of the life and presence of Christ, the *organic union of believers*, is wanted to unite them; the very thing which Dorner rejects as a dogmatic error. There is a malignant devil, the very spirit of Anti-Christ, which, unconsciously, controls this unchurchly spirit. Not until the coming of Christ—the reawakening consciousness

of His real presence in the Church—will this anti-Christian spirit be cast out, and the Church become united.

§ 65. How very different from that of Dorner is the noble and sublime testimony of his contemporary Church Historian, Dr. Schaff, which we will here quote for the benefit of our readers. He says:

"The Apostolic Church appears as a free, independent, and complete organism, a system of supernatural, divine life in a human body. It contains in itself all the offices and energies required for its purpose. . . . As to its membership, it was not free from impurities, the after-workings of Judaism and heathenism and the natural man. But in virtue of an *inherent authority*, it exercised rigid discipline, and thus steadily asserted its dignity and holiness. . . . Paul defines the Church as the body of Christ. He thus represents it as an organic living system of various members, powers, functions, and at the same time as the abode of Christ and the organ of His redeeming and sanctifying influence upon the world. Christ is, in one view, the ruling head, in another the invisible, all-pervading soul, of this body. Christ without the Church were a head without a body, a fountain without a stream, a king without subjects, a captain without soldiers, a bridegroom without a bride. The Church without Christ were a body without soul or spirit, a lifeless corpse. [Everything is made to depend on the life of Christ.] The Church lives only as Christ lives and moves and works in her. At every movement of her existence she is dependent on Him, as the body on the soul, or the branches on the vine. But on His part He perpetually bestows upon her His heavenly gifts and supernatural powers, continually reveals Himself in her, and uses her as His organ for the spread of His kingdom and the Christianizing of the world, till principalities and powers yield free [not slavish] obedience to Him, as the eternal Prophet, Priest and King of the regenerate race. This work must be a gradual process of history. The idea of body, and of *all organic life*, includes that of development, of expansion and consolidation. And hence the same Paul speaks also of the growth and edification of the body of Christ, till we

all come into the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. . . . The very mission of the Church is, to reconcile all men with God, and to make them all true Christians, followers of Christ, prophets, priests and kings." *History of the Christian Church*, § 40 *and* § 45.

Thus also in his Introduction to Church History, § 4, he says: "Christianity exists not merely as something subjective in single pious individuals, but also as an objective, organized, visible society, as a kingdom of Christ on earth, or as a Church. The Church is in part a pedagogic institution to train men for heaven . . . in part the everlasting communion of the redeemed, both on earth and in heaven. . . . Though the Church is thus a society of men, yet it is by no means on that account a production of men . . . like freemasonry, temperance societies and the various political and literary associations. It is founded by *God* Himself through *Christ*, through His incarnation, His life, His sufferings, death and resurrection and the outpouring of the *Holy Ghost*, for His own glory and the redemption of the world. For this very reason, the gates of hell itself can never prevail against it. It is the ark of Christianity, out of which there is no salvation; the channel of the continuous revelation of the Triune God and the powers of eternal life. . . . We may justly say, that the Church is the continuation of the life and work of Christ upon earth. . . . In the Church, the Lord is perpetually born anew in the hearts of believers through the Holy Ghost, who reveals Christ to us and appropriates His work and merits to the individual soul. In the Church the Lord speaks words of truth and consolation to fallen man. In and through her He heals the sick, raises the dead, distributes the heavenly manna, gives Himself as spiritual food to the hungry soul. In her are repeated His sufferings and death; and in her, too, are continually celebrated His resurrection and ascension, and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. . . . In her womb must we be born again of incorruptible seed; from her breast must we be nourished into spiritual life. For she is the Lamb's bride, the dwelling of the Holy Ghost, the temple of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth."

Speaking of the development of the Church, Schaff says: "The complete appropriation of the life of Christ is accomplished only by a gradual process. . . . The whole process, however, is but the full actual unfolding of the Church which existed potentially at the outset in Christ. . . . This development, moreover, is *organic*. It is not an outward, mechanical aggregation of facts which have no living connection. . . The Church, like Christianity itself, of which it is the vehicle, is a supernatural principle, a new creation of God through Christ, far transcending all that human intelligence and will can of themselves produce."

§ 66. In the same high tone, Dr. Schaff speaks of the office of the ministry, "which was instituted by Christ Himself in person," the "design of which is none other than that of the mission of Christ Himself—the redemption of the world from sin and error, and the extension and completion of the kingdom of God, as a kingdom of truth, love, holiness, and peace. Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers are divinely appointed, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the Faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God, into a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ (Eph. iv. 11–13).

"The spiritual office or ministry," he continues, "is the vehicle of the powers of divine grace, the appointed channel for conveying the blessings of the Gospel to mankind; the organ through which the Holy Ghost acts upon the world and gradually transforms it into the kingdom of God." "This office is the main instrument of carrying out the divine plan of salvation, and from it proceeds almost all motion and progress in the Church. The apostles, and in a wider view, all ministers of the Gospel, are the salt of the earth, which preserves humanity from putrefaction and gives it its proper savor. They are the light of the world, shedding the rays of eternal light into the night of the natural heart and upon all relations of human existence (Matt. v. 13-16). They are laborers together with God (1 Cor. iii. 19), and stewards of the mysteries of God, which they should faithfully dispense, and of which they must one

day give an account (1 Cor. iv. 1. Tit. i. 7. 1 Pet. iv. 10). They are ambassadors for Christ, who, as though God Himself spoke through them, pray sinners in Christ's stead: Be ye reconciled to God (2 Cor. v. 20). Since the Lord Himself appears in His servants, the reception or rejection of them is the same as a reception or rejection of Christ; the one is attended with a rich blessing, the other with a heavy curse. 'He that receiveth you, receiveth Me; and he that receiveth Me, receiveth Him that sent Me.'" *His. of Apost. Church*, § 124, *and His. of Christian Church*, § 40.

§ 67. This is Mercersburg theology, as taught by Schaff and Nevin, and as it is still taught at our institutions, under the broad sanction of the German Reformed Church in the United States. That it widely differs from Modern theology has never been made a secret. It is just what we endeavored clearly to show in our book, which has been made the subject of Professor Dorner's criticism. We have presented his leading objections to the theology which it advocates, and our reply to his strictures. We are done with them.

§ 68. But we have a few more words to say in reference to Modern theology. What has all this controversy with *Dr. Dorner* to do with *its* underlying fundamental principle? Does *he* say one word in *its* defense? Does he afford a single stroke of the pen in its favor? Not a bit of it. He utterly repudiates and discards it. He cannot believe, that any respectable portion of American divines and ministers can be so far behind the age, as still to adhere to Locke's mode of thinking. He fully agrees with us, that Locke's system leads to materialism and infidelity. There may still exist much of the old supernaturalism, he says, to which our portraiture applies; but it is to him preposterous, that any one should make the abstract understanding and common sense the basis and umpire in matters of Faith and religion. For him the evidences of Christianity rest on an infinitely higher ground than this low, superficial and rationalistic conception. For his mind the certainty of the truth of Christianity rests on nothing short of the personal experience of its redeeming power!

This, of course, is going too far, and is an extreme in the opposite direction, inasmuch as it affords and allows no objective evidence of Christianity whatever. It makes the Word of God and every other form of objective revelation of none effect. It is, in truth, but a rebound from the abstract rationalistic (or realistic) to the abstract spiritualistic (or idealistic) position. It is remarkable, that the advocates of modern theology, or American Puritans, can make the rebound so readily; how they can vault into Dorner's transatlantic aerial boat and be lifted above Mercersburg, without as much as stopping to greet us on their upward flight. Mercersburg theology somehow all at once became altogether too "intellectualistic" and not mystical and cloudy enough! It does not make personal experience of salvation alone the ground of certainty of the truth of Christianity. It is for this reason, that Dorner objects to Mercersburg theology; and not because we take higher ground than Modern theology; which any time in the day can prove the truth of Christianity to a demonstration without starting from any self-evident principles whatever! We are curious to see how it will go to work to prove it from the very satisfactory premises furnished by Dorner!

A man may think that his personal experience of salvation affords a very satisfactory evidence of the truth of Christianity to himself. But how he is going to make it bear on the mind of another, is quite a different matter. And it is this, precisely, with which theology, as a *science*, has mainly to do. It may appear an easy matter for a man to construct a system of theology to his own satisfaction, but not quite so easy to give general satisfaction. But unless it can do this, neither can it be *truly* satisfactory to his own mind; for the laws of thinking for his mind are not different from what they are for the mind as such, or the general mind.

Neither the abstract spiritualistic, nor the abstract rationalistic position afford a sufficientlygeneral basis or starting point, on which a satisfactory system can be constructed.

§ 69. The Mercersburg system takes as its base the general Faith of the Christian Church in all ages, as expressed in the

Creed. It asks nobody to accept anything in the premises or conclusion, but what is legitimately involved in the first principles of Christianity, as it is already accepted by the universal Faith of the Christian Church. A more general and universal basis of theology than this cannot be found, and hence none that can possibly be more generally and universally satisfactory.

But even the Creed has its presuppositions, that are more general than itself. It presupposes in the individual, who is challenged with it and embraces it, a spiritual capacity, a subjective Faith, to which its object can authenticate itself as true. Thus for instance:

1. *On the part of those, who stand in the new covenant and have received the blessing of Christian baptism in infancy*, this subjective Faith is normally developed by Christian nurture from the life of Christ or the new birth, in which the Christian salvation—remission of sin as well as the renewing of the Holy Ghost—is germinally comprehended. When this Faith is properly developed, it will recognize its object, humbly submit to it, and come to its joyful and heartfelt confession of our undoubted Christian Faith. It is saving, true Christian Faith.

2. *On the part of those, who are not yet embraced in the new covenant, but are challenged with the objects of Faith as expressed in the Creed*, the challenge may not be disregarded and rejected with impunity. Like all objective truth, when it is brought home, it takes possession of man, makes its power felt and known in its objectivity, before it can bring the subject to bow before it and submit to it. It first apprehends man before he apprehends it. It lays hold on him, before he lays hold on it. Being apprehended by it, it still requires man's free determination to submit to it, by repenting and receiving baptism for the remission of sins. Not until his Faith has thus passed through the ethical process of repentance and humble submission to what the Gospel requires of him, will he realize the certainty of its redeeming power. But the Faith that *preceded* this final submission, though not in itself saving, was not by any means, as Dorner would have it, a blind ac-

ceptance of arbitrary authority. No *free* submission, as required in the case, could take place, to mere arbitrary authority. It is Faith in the primary principles of objective Christianity, as all men can exercise it, when brought through the preaching of the Gospel with its innate divine power under its self-authenticating and enlightening influence. These first principles are expressed in their logical order in the Creed; and as they are the underlying first principles of all true and sound experimental and practical Christianity, so they are, at the same time, the necessary first principles of a sound system of Theology, which not only commends itself to the mind of the experienced Christian, but to the mind as such, and the laws of thinking by which it is governed. Reduced to their last ground, these principles are comprehended in "Christ and Him crucified," or in "Christ the Son of the living God;" a principle that is not revealed to us by flesh and blood, and yet one, whose saving power is experienced only when weak, sinful and self-reliant man with penitent Faith *submits* himself to its redeeming power. The confession of Peter's faith, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God," and Peter's penitent Faith in Christ as the Redeemer, after he had so shamefully denied his Lord, shows us the conscious relation, in which the *general* and the *particular* hold in the constitution of true Christian Faith. First Faith in Christ, then Faith that He can save even so great a sinner as Peter felt himself to be. All this, the *general* and the *particular* constituents of true Faith, is expressed in the Creed, when *faith in Christ* is joined with *Faith in the remission of sins*, &c., and constitute the essential first princples of a sound and satisfactory system of theology; which, to be scientifically correct and satisfactory in the detail of its positive results, must be able to refer them, and all, to a general principle as the ultimate basis of certainty on which they primarily depend—and that principle is Christ, the Son of the living God, the ultimate objective ground of all truths, revealed not to the abstract understanding, but to Faith, their ultimate subjective ground.

ART. V. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH MOVEMENT.

BY THE EDITOR.

THE following Prospectus of the Church Monthly, an Episcopalian Magazine, indicates something of the nature of the Church Movement, as it is now going forward in the Episcopal Church in this country.

"The *Church Monthly* will, hereafter, be published in the city of New York. It is proposed, in taking this step, to advance to a position held by none of the Church periodicals in this country; to set forward the cause of the *Catholic Reformation*, which is so imperatively demanded both in our own Church and throughout Christendom.

"Thus avowing its position, the *Monthly* offers its pages as the medium of communication between those who are as yet only an unorganized school of Catholic thinkers and workers.

"We shall bow with implicit submission to the decisions of that Holy Catholic Church, which our own Church in this country has acknowledged as her own rule and authority in all matters pertaining to faith and order.

"Loyal to the principles and to the integrity of the Anglican Church, we seek not the absorption of that Church into either the Greek or the Roman, but the restoration, by all honorable means, of intercommunion between all branches of the *One Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.*

"We shall urge the cause of *Catholic Reform;* first as a complete work embracing the whole cycle of doctrine, discipline and worship, giving their due prominence to doctrine and discipline as the ground work of worship, and insisting upon Catholic principles and Catholic work as necessary to a healthy advance in Catholic Ritual, and secondly, we shall advocate these principles and this work as specially adapted to meet the religious wants of our own country."

The movement here indicated is doubtless designed to coöperate with a corresponding movement in the Church of England, to which it owes its origin, and with whose success or failure its own destiny will be closely connected. The movement in England may be designated as the second stadium in the history of Puseyism, which commenced about thirty years ago, and received its first impulse from the famous "Tracts for the Times." It is claimed by its friends to be a reaction against the ultra-Puritanism which followed the Reformation of the sixteenth century in England. This reaction was delayed, it is said, first, by the unsuspected Popish proclivities of the Stuarts; secondly, by the German free-thinking tendencies of the House of Hanover, and the sad example in matters of religion of all the sovereigns of that house, except George III. During the last decade it has given birth to the so-called Ritualistic movement in the Anglican Church, which has already made such great strides, that it threatens an entire revolution in the Church of England. In Ritualism, or Sacramentalism as it is styled by its friends, we have an earnest effort to carry out into practice the principles of Puseyism. In the Tracts for the Times the question was pressed in its theological aspects; in Ritualism it asserts itself in the worship and practice of the Church. It gathers its strength around the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist, and the rites connected with their worship all take their character from the manner of celebrating this holy mystery. Along with the multiplication of forms in worship, it seeks to revive also the Church's ministry to the wants of the poor and suffering. Sisterhoods are established to provide for ministering to the sick and the destitute, schools are organized, and altogether there is such a revival of devotion and activity as the English Church has not witnessed since the Reformation. It reminds one of the days of John Wesley and the Methodist movement, although it looks, of course, in a different direction from that. We take for granted that our readers are more or less familiar with the facts of its history. They have formed for some time the staple of religious news from England. An interesting account of the practical side of

the movement is given by an English Ritualist in the *Atlantic Monthly* for February.

We have said that the Catholic Church movement in the Episcopal Church in this country is intimately connected with this Ritualistic movement in England. Corresponding to the two phases of Episcopalianism in England, we have had here also for years a High-church party and a Low-church party. And now, simultaneous with the revival of Sacramentalism in England, we have also the Ritualistic movement in this country. St. Alban's in New York is an imitation, though only partial, and to a considerable extent faulty, it is said, of St. Alban's in England. So also, the effort to cut loose from Protestantism, and repudiate the Reformation of the sixteenth century, which the party represented in the Church Monthly are making is, only an echo of the Catholic movement in England.

There is much in this Catholic movement in the Episcopalian Church to commend it to all who believe in the Holy Catholic Church, as a supernatural order of grace in the world. On its theoretical side its supporters seek to revive new interest in doctrines which have for their seal the teachings of the Church in all ages. Beginning with the great central mystery in the order of the Church service, the Holy Eucharist, they seek to clothe with its full meaning the doctrine of the Real Presence in that sacred ordinance. Their belief here, as defined in a memorial to the Archbishop of Canterbury, dated 30th May, 1867, contains nothing which the Reformed faith cannot endorse, except the conclusion in regard to the adoration of the Real Presence.

"We repudiate the opinion of a 'corporeal presence of Christ's flesh and blood,'—that is to say, of the presence of His body and blood as they 'are in heaven;' and the conception of the mode of His presence, which implies the physical change of the natural substances of the bread and wine, commonly called 'Transubstantiation.'

"We believe that in the Holy Eucharist by virtue of the consecration, through the power of the Holy Ghost, the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, 'the inward part, or thing

signified,' are present really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, under 'the outward visible part or sign,' or 'form of bread and wine.'"*

Going out from this centre of Christian worship they seek to revive faith in the powers and graces of the supernatural world as present in the ordinances and services of the Church. This is a movement in the right direction, as over against the prevalent rationalism which can see no mystery in the Church. Of the multiplication of rites and ceremonies in worship, which forms the *ritualistic* element in their movement, and which is sometimes ignorantly confounded with *liturgical* elements in worship, we can only say that the excess here is not a whit worse than the lack of all reverent forms in much Protestant worship. We believe they are excessive, but what shall we say of the custom in many of our city Churches where worshippers will neither stand nor kneel during prayer, but continue sitting, as though the body should take no part in rendering obeisance to the God we worship!

On the practical side, the Ritualistic movement seeks especially to carry out the saying of Christ, "The poor have the Gospel preached unto them." Their work among the poor has been immense. "They have built stately Churches, with most magnificent and costly interiors, for their special use, in all parts of the country. They have established and kept up, by their own exertions, no less than fifty-seven homes for sick and aged persons; nine general and convalescent hospitals for incurables; ten missions to fallen women; twenty-seven penitentiaries for fallen women who wish to train themselves for better things;

* The conclusion, however, that "Christ himself really and truly, but ineffably, present in the sacrament, is therein to be adored," is a false inference from the doctrine of the Real Presence. We must distinguish in the Holy Eucharist between the Giver and that which He gives. When He said, "Take eat, this is my body," there were not two Christs, the one giving, the other given, neither was that which was given a part of Christ, as though He were divided. He did not say, "Take eat, this is myself." Hence if the disciples had performed an act of adoration when they received the bread and wine, they would have had to adore the giver, and not the thing given, even though it was the body and blood of Christ. The Real Presence in the Eucharist must ever be distinguished from the personal presence of Christ now at the right hand of God.

twenty-four brotherhoods and guilds; forty-one sisterhoods; and nineteen associations for general religious purposes." They have made immense sacrifices from their own private fortunes. One priest, Father Wagner of Brighton, it is said, has devoted his whole fortune of $150,000 to the Church, except a small yearly income to supply his own frugal wants. Their clergy devote themselves wholly to their work, often living in rooms but poorly furnished, and yet with entire cheerfulness ministering to the poor and the suffering.

All this, it is true, may be done *without* charity, but those only are prepared to judge it who do all these things *with* charity. And their judgment, we believe, would be favorable. It is a wholesome reaction to the wholesale neglect of this side of the Christian life among Protestant churches. These have to a large extent left this work to the State with its poor-houses, asylums, and hospitals. The reaction is showing itself in other churches also. These works of charity are coming to be conducted more by the churches than they were for a time past. Orphan Homes are beginning to be established again by churches, and Christian people are beginning to feel more and more that it has been a grand mistake to suppose that the State can do their work here, requiring only their taxes to support its benevolent institutions: the ministration to bodily wants must be joined with ministrations to those of the spiritual nature also, and these latter the Church only can perform. One other feature in this Ritualistic movement, which we are glad to see, is its tendency to free itself from the unnatural alliance of Church and State which exists in England. It has had this tendency from its inception. If it is unnatural and wrong for the Church to tyrannize over the State, it is equally monstrous to make the civil power, as it culminates in a King or Queen, judge and rule the Church. There are movements in the Kingdom of Great Britain now which can hardly fail to result in an entire revolution in the relation of Church and State. In the case of the Ritualists there is a strong feeling that it is a grievous wrong for the Church to be subjected to the civil power. If the civil authority persists in ruling against their movement,

the probability is that they will separate themselves from the Establishment, and stand on the same footing in relation to the State as the dissenting bodies. This we believe would prove a lasting blessing. The tangling alliances of the Church with the State in Europe are only calculated to embarrass and retard any free movement in the Church itself. They belong to a period of history which is past. It is an old patch on the new garment of the history of the 19th century. We sincerely believe it would be better for the Churches of Germany also to seek the same disinthrallment. They too are hampered and crippled in their action by this condition of things.

The movement of Ritualism, or Sacramentalism, is earnest in its spirit, and large in its proportions. They claim to have over sixty churches in London, and not less than one million and a half avowed supporters in the United Kingdom. In the United States, those who are in sympathy with the movement constitute the strongest portion of the American Episcopal Church. Considering its history, its growth, its earnestness and activity, it is plain that it is a movement which must exert a powerful, if not a controlling, influence upon the Anglican Church wherever it exists. On this account we would like to see it free itself from whatever faults or errors may have become connected with it, and labor successfully for the solution of the Church Question, which is coming home with increased solemnity to the whole of Protestantism. And on this account we regret that it seeks to occupy a position in relation to Protestantism which we believe will prove to be its great and fundamental error.

This is the point to which we wish to limit our criticism of this Catholic church movement in the Episcopalian Church of England and America. It aims to separate itself from Protestantism. In doing this it is attempting to take a position, we believe, which it cannot maintain. Its history and destiny are so interwoven with Protestantism that a movement of this character must end in disappointment and disaster. It may accomplish some good in the way of reforming evils and errors in Protestantism, but as a church, we think it must be either

Roman Catholic or Protestant. A *via media* must prove in the end only a passage for its members into the Roman Catholic Church.

In taking this ground we are not unmindful of the fact that there is a Church in existence which is neither Roman Catholic nor Protestant. The existence of the Greek Church is a remarkable fact in Christian history. Its continued existence cannot be explained by comparing it with an eddy or sluggish body of water, left standing by itself, while the current flows onward. It has a history, though not so active and progressive as that of the Roman Church, nor yet of the Protestant. Its future is so connected with the great Russian nationality, which is coming more and more to occupy an important position in history, that it will yet, no doubt, perform its part also in the history of the Church as a whole. We have no theory to present in regard to it. But it is not difficult to see that its position can be no example for the Anglican Church. The two are so widely different, that nothing in the case we are considering can be argued from the Greek Church for the position the English Church is attempting to take. The Greek Church has never passed through the history that the English Church has passed through. It was not a party in the mighty movement of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, whereas the Church of England was. And this is the first point we make in criticising this attempt of the Catholics in the Anglican Church, as they call themselves, to separate their life and fortunes from Protestantism.

The Episcopalian Church of England and America is a Protestant Church. It was comprehended in the life currents of the Protestant Reformation, and became what it is by virtue of that Reformation. Previous to that epoch it was Roman Catholic in common with the German Church. Whatever may be said as to its origin, in favor of its claims to being originally and normally independent of the Roman See, it came to be, in the regular course of its history an integral part of the Roman Communion. Thousands and millions of members within its pale, lived and died as members of the Roman Catholic Church.

Its dismemberment from that body was not a mere throwing off of a foreign power, and a return to its original condition. An illustration of what we mean may be found in the relation of the several states to the American Union. Even though they were once independent states or colonies, they are now integral parts of one nation. They cannot return to their original position,—they cannot throw off the authority of the Union and stand forth as isolated, independent states. They cannot do this because of their history. They are branches of an organism. They are parts of a nation. The only possible way to become separated from that nation, against its consent, is through a revolution which must carry in it the ripened forces and elements of a new nationality.

Even allowing all, therefore, that the most strenuous Episcopalians may contend for, as to the origin of their Church,—though St. Paul himself founded it (!), yet it was for centuries an integral, organic, portion of the Roman Catholic Church, and it could become separated from that Church only by a needless and sinful schism, or by such a movement as the Reformation, which proved itself to be the birth-period of a new stadium in the history of the Christian Church. In any case it would be a poor, mechanical, view of history indeed, to conceive of a Church throwing off certain errors, and returning to a former state and condition, and call this a Reformation. An individual does not reform his life in that way. The surmounting of error and corruption requires necessarily a positive, as well as a negative movement. There must be not merely a renunciation, but a positive advance, in the power of which alone such renunciation is possible.

The Romanist, it is true, avoids this theory of growth and development in the Church, by teaching that the Church is unchangeable. But this will not do for the Episcopalian; for he holds that the Church was changeable, in that it allowed error and corruption gradually to increase within its communion. He holds that the Roman Church did develop, and that its development comprehended also a progress in error and corruption. Now granting this, is it possible, in the case of a living

organism, such as the Church, to cast aside these errors and corruptions, without receiving power to do so by an inward and positive movement in the life of the Church itself?

Here lies the weakness of any theory of mere repristination. History cannot go back and repeat itself, any more than a human being can live his life over again. True, Luther himself in one of his sermons, teaches that in every act of repentance we betake ourselves to our baptism, in which our sins are washed away; but this is not in the sense of undoing our history, but rather surmounting the evil, by giving ourselves up to the impulse of new life begotten within us in our baptism. And so the Church may return to the period of its founding and early, fresh, vigor, to receive new inspiration and new light, but only in order that it may move onward victoriously from its present position.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century, was such a positive movement in the history of the Church. It was not merely negative in protesting against the errors and corruptions of the Roman Church, but it was positive also in bringing forward new principles of faith and authority,—principles which were indeed involved in what the Church had always possessed in its creed, but which had not previously been brought out to the clear Christian consciousness. As such a movement it had its period of preparation. It was not ushered in suddenly, but it came to its birth by a due course of history. There were *reformers before the Reformation.* And when it really came to its birth, it appears everywhere as far more than a mere protest against Rome. We behold in its leading characters a struggling towards a new consciousness of freedom in grace. The old *forms* of unity and authority were giving way before the new epoch, which looked towards a realization of a higher, and more free form of unity, as well as a higher and more free form of authority.

Without carrying out this thought further, what we mean to assert now is, that the Church of England was freely comprehended in this movement of the Reformation, and it was this only which gave it power to separate from the Roman Church,

and surmount its errors. History tells us of quarrels with the pope before that of Henry VIII. The English, like their cousins in Germany, were restive under the authority of Rome. But the times were not ripe for any movement which would place them in a position higher than that occupied generally in the Roman Church. In all differences and quarrels the English Church still remained loyal to Rome. "Henry the VIIIth," we are told by Macaulay, "attempted to constitute an Anglican Church, differing from the Roman Catholic on the point of the supremacy, and on that point alone. . . . But Henry's system died with him." There was a larger movement coming which swept the English Church out of Romanism and made it Protestant. This movement carried with it principles which wrought, by their own inherent power, a separation from Rome, and a separation, too, which left the English Church fairly committed to Protestantism. The Protestant principles which produced the English Reformation were not secondary or accidental elements in the movement by which that Church was placed in antagonism to Rome, but they were central and controlling. The English Church and the English nation felt this. The very title of that Church shows it. The word Protestant was even incorporated in the oath of the bishop. To drop the title Protestant now is to deny their parentage. Even if they drop the title, and call themselves *Catholics*, a title which can be taken as well by other Protestant Churches, yet they stand forth historically as a body that came through the Reformation, and this fact they cannot set aside as easily as a name.

On this account doubtless the Episcopalian Church of England finds a sort of gulf of separation between themselves and the Greek Church. It is known that they have been anxious to come to some understanding with the Greek Church. They would rather fraternize with these Greek brethren, than with any of the Protestant Churches. But the Greeks do not recognize them. They seem to be farther removed from them than the Roman Catholics. Why is this? The Greek Church has never passed through an epoch such as the Reformation. They stand yet on the other side. Hence they cannot mingle with these English Christians.

It is not possible for the English Church, or any portion of it, to establish that the Reformation was for them merely outward and accidental. Protestantism is ingrained in the life and spirit of their people. It moulds the genius of the national life of England. And this, too, notwithstanding their separation from other Protestant bodies by their peculiar theory of Apostolic succession. This was not regarded originally as necessarily forming a bar of separation from other Protestant Churches. The historian Macaulay, who though not an authority in theology, undoubtedly possessed a clear insight into the religious as well as political life of England, says: "The founders of the Anglican Church took a middle course. They retained episcopacy; but they did not declare it to be an institution essential to the welfare of a Christian society, or to the efficacy of the sacraments. The German Church of the reformation might have retained the Apostolic succession in this form, yet it would have been none the less Protestant for that, as was the case indeed with one wing of the Lutheran Church, viz: the Church of Sweden. It is not a dogma of Protestantism that no Church can be Protestant which holds to the Apostolic succession in the line of an Episcopate. Protestantism does not ground itself in any such outward characteristic of the Church, but rather in that deep life-movement which brought the old Church to a new stadium of Christian freedom, by bringing out the subjective side of the life of grace. Our conclusion, therefore, is that the English Church cannot un-Protestantize itself, if it would, by any mere theory which it may now hold. It has passed a Rubicon, which seals its character as an integral portion of Protestantism; and whatever reform it may now propose (and we do not deny the necessity of a great reformation for Protestantism) it should propose fairly and squarely *in* Protestantism, not *out* of it.

We have to urge further against this theory of the anti-Protestant Catholic movement in the Anglican Church, that it involves itself in contradictions from which it cannot possibly extricate itself. In renouncing the Protestant theory of the Church it renders itself unable to answer the theory of Rome.

The Anglican theory takes issue with Rome in regard to the outward form of the Church's unity. The Romanist holds that this centres in the see of St. Peter. If the Church is a visible organism, it must have one centre, and only those are branches of the Catholic Church which stand in organic relation to this centre. As a matter of fact Rome was the acknowledged centre of the whole Church for centuries, and even after the separation of the Greek Church, the Anglican continued to hold as from this centre down to the sixteenth century. When it separated from that centre it became a schismatic body, and it is no longer a portion of the one holy Catholic Church. So the Romanist argues.

The Anglican theory holds that there never was rightly such centre of unity. The Episcopate is the only centre it will allow, next after Christ, and consequently there may be many centres of this kind. The only visible unity it will allow, is a certain outward intercommunion between these different Episcopal sees. Thus it finds three Catholic Churches in existence, the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican, but *the* Catholic Church, nevertheless, is *one*. How this unity finds expression it is difficult for them to define. Sometimes it seems to be for them only a thing of the past, as for instance when they find it in the undivided Church before the Greek schism. Then it found expression for its unity in the general councils. But even then these several churches stood as coördinate, and their unity after all was of an external character.

So now, in seeking for a restoration of unity the Anglican theory looks to a similar outward arrangement. According to the Prospectus, quoted at the beginning of this article, it seeks only the "*restoration*, by all honorable means, of inter-communion between all branches of the one, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church." The highest form in which this could be reached, doubtless, would be a General Council of the bishops in the three Churches. But to this the *Catholic World* pertinently replies: "Where is the authority to convoke it, to determine who may or may not sit in it, and to confirm its acts? You say, summon all the bishops of the Roman, the Greek, and

the Anglican bodies. But who has authority to summon them, and why summon these and no others? who shall say? It is the same question we have had up before. Why extend or why confine the Catholic Church to the three Churches named? Where there is no recognized centre of authority, that is to say, no recognized authority, there is no authority to admit or exclude. It is necessary that authority define which is the Catholic Church, before you can say what organizations it includes or excludes, or what prelates or ministers have the right to be summoned as Catholic prelates or ministers, and what not."

Equally pertinent is the remark, in criticising this theory, that "it assumes that unity may be evolved from multiplicity." Whereas, according to all sound philosophy, "the universal precedes the particulars and generates them, and when it goes, they go with it. Unity precedes multiplicity, and produces, sustains, and directs it." We do not believe the Anglican theory can escape from the grasp of the Romanist here. So long as the conception of Church unity is of this outward character, whether centering in Episcopates and a Council, or in a Papacy, the Romanist has, we think, decidedly the advantage. The conception cannot stop in an Episcopate, any more than history stopped there. The history of the Church pressed with logical necessity towards an *Episcopus Episcoporum*, and *on this line* of argument logic will come to the same conclusion. Any one who reads the history of the early Church can see that the tendency towards unity pressed just as necessarily to an expression in the Papacy, as it did towards a partial and imperfect expression in the Episcopate and Patriarchate. These latter formed local centres, but there was felt still more strongly the necessity of a unity in outward form which would embrace the episcopal centres. We know full well that this statement is regarded as ridiculous by Romanists. They argue that it is unphilosophical as well as contrary to the facts of history, to say that the parts of the Church were before the centre to which they are bound. And the Anglican just as strenuously asserts that the form of Episcopacy was not the result of a movement or development in the Church, but that it is of divine appoint-

ment. We beg leave to differ with both, while we concede the conclusiveness of the Roman theory as over against the Anglican. If the unity of the Church, as to its outward form, holds in such an organism as the Anglican conceives, then we believe he simply makes himself absurd to argue against the Romanist with his papal see. If the organic character of the Church lies primarily in the outward form, as Dr. Ewer maintains, as the Anglican theory of the Church requires, then, to our view, the Roman theory has the best of the argument, as is shown in an able article on the subject in a recent number of the *Catholic World.*

Wherein, then, lies the fallacy of the Roman theory of the unity of the Church? We conceive that it is to be found in its failing to distinguish between the Church in *idea*, and the Church in *actuality*. With the Romanist there is no ideal Church. With him the Church is *only* visible. Hence what he calls its centre of unity, its "original central cell, from which the whole organism proceeds, in which its vital principle inheres, and which is the type, creator, originator, and director of all its vital phenomena," is the Roman see. When it is said, "Jesus Christ is the living centre of unity," he replies, "Certainly; but not the centre of a *visible* unity, for Jesus Christ is not visible to us." Hence Christ must have a *vice-gerent* on earth, so that the Church may start, and hold in organic union, with a Christ on earth. The unity of the Church must be perfect in its outward form from the beginning, and continue such throughout all time.

But this is not the nature of the organism of the Church. The Church is not *two*, visible and invisible, as many Protestants imagine, neither is it visible only as the Romanist maintains, but it is *one*, visible and invisible. It starts in the glorified, vivific, humanity of the risen and ascended Christ, as this is made to reach down into the world, the principle of a new creation, through the mediation of the Holy Ghost. It is one, because the life of Christ is one, and the centre of its unity is perpetually in Jesus Christ. On its ideal side it is perfect and complete, containing all the powers and graces which

subsist in the glorified humanity of Christ. But in actualizing itself, as it comes into the world, Jerusalem from above, the mother of us all, it must reproduce itself in the free activity of men. The ideal and actual here fall together in one, so that we do not believe in two Churches, and yet the actual can become the complete image of the ideal, only by a process of Christian history. It is true that there must be a point of contact on earth where the life of Christ enters the world, and from which it goes forth in a visible organism. This point we find in the congregation, with the Apostles at the head, upon whom the Holy Ghost descended on the day of Pentecost. From thence the powers and graces of this new creation, as from an original cell, go out* through an ordained ministry and the divinely appointed institutions of the Church through all the ages of time, and all portions of the world. Now while it is true that the ideal centre of unity, as containing the life which perpetually flows to all the members is before the members, and constitutes them by its law a communion, yet the actual unity in the organism of the Church forms for itself a centre as the result of the unifying forces at work in the Church. In other words, the ideal unity of the Church struggles to actualize itself in visible form. This is no philosophical absurdity. We have analogies of the same thing continually around us. The human race is an organism. As humanity it is one in its life; and yet its outward unity does not by any means correspond to its inward unity of life. The forces of history tend continually towards this end, through dialectic processes, but how contradictory it seems to the idea of the organic unity of the race, that whole sections of it should exist for centuries, separated from all other sections, by

* If the *Catholic World* wishes us to point to an original cell as forming the centre of life in the visible Church, we prefer this Apostolic congregation, composed of Apostles and members, to a perpetual papacy. True, it will say that this congregation passed away and is no more, but so does the original cell in the organisms of nature perish, after giving life to the plant. Adam has passed away, and yet the principle of humanity continues in his descendants. The human body starts in a "central cell," yet where is that cell in the developed body? And where is the centre of the bodily life? The life of the Church, starting in this first congregation in Jerusalem flows on in the organism of the Church, and subsists perpetually in Jesus Christ, who is the head of the Church.

self-appointed barriers, as Chinese walls! More and more mankind are coming to an actualization of that unity which inheres in its deepest life. We have the same thing illustrated in national unity, which is the unity of an organism likewise. The centre of dispensing powers, whether a King, President, Council, or Congress, is an expression or actualization of the ideal unity of the national life. The *Catholic World*, in its article on he Anglican theory of Church unity, seek, to destroy the force of the analogy, by asserting that the political sovereignty lies in the nation, or in the people; but it is also above the people, a sovereignty from God, and its organic head or centre is the representative of law for the people, which does not originate in them, but is from God.

The Church is the highest and most free organism in the world; it is an organism in which the natural and the supernatural are united. Christ is the head of the Church. His presence on earth is his own vice-gerency, that is, there is a historical Christ, now at the right hand of God, and a Christ mystical, the *mystical presence* of Christ by the Holy Ghost. The presence of Christ asserts and authenticates itself through appointed organs, the holy ministry, the word which they preach, and the sacraments they dispense. Now the unity of the Church holds in the one life by which it is continually animated. This life must take to itself a form according to its own law. It will seek at once to become a perfect unity in the outward form; but as the actual Church does not at any time correspond perfectly with its law of life, so also the form of unity which it realizes comes short of the ideal. As the dispensation of Judaism was a theocracy, so the Church started as a Christocracy, in which the Christians had all things in common. The free movement of Christian history required orders and subordinate centres in the governing power. Then came bishoprics, patriarchates, and finally, the papacy. The Jews clamored for a king and God gave them a king, but it does not follow that they might not have maintained their unity under judges as well, if they had been true to God, their absolute King. The Church tended towards an episcopal centre and

they found such centre in a papacy. The union now seemed complete. It was a historical necessity. But the time came when it proved itself inadequate. The form assumed the mastery over the spirit, until the spirit asserted its superiority to the existing form of Church unity. The unity was not broken in the Reformation, but life broke loose from the old forms, and began to take to itself a new form of organization in Protestantism. Now what is required is, that with its members as free, active, agents, it shall come to a higher form of unity.* This unity after which Protestantism struggles is not to be a union formed from without, by bringing together its different sections in a mechanical way, but it is to be a unity unfolded genetically and brought out historically by the unifying life of the Church itself. We are to apprehend the unity which apprehends us, and by faith become the free organs for it to assert and actualize itself. Here is the problem before us. While we are moving towards its solution, the Romanist may look with pity or contempt upon our struggles, while he points exultingly to his papal see, as the centre of unity for his Church. So the monarchies of Europe looked doubtingly upon the process of realizing a complete and lasting unity in the republic of the new world. And when the trial of civil war came, they expected to see the nation shattered to atoms. But the unity of a republic proved itself stronger than that of a monarchy, because it is more free.

The idea of unity we have briefly and imperfectly indicated, is not a unity produced from multiplicity. This is charged

---

* Here again we have analogies in nature of the fact that organisms change their forms, while they maintain their identity. In the vegetable and animal kingdoms we see them around us every day. The butterfly loses not its identity with its former chrysalis state, notwithstanding the change that has taken place. So also, and as an analogy lying nearer to our subject, how often the forms of governments undergo vast outward changes while the national life flows on. The form exists as type in the law of the life of every organism, but the law is not held in bondage by the form. On the other hand, it is so master of the form that it can actualize itself in different forms, the same in certain characteristics, while differing in others. Much more must this be the case in the organism of the Church. Then it must always be remembered, that no analogy from nature can fully explain the nature of the Church. The Kingdom of heaven rather illumines nature.

in the *Catholic World.* "The essential error of the non-catholic church theory is, that it denies the central cell or germ whence is evolved or produced the whole Church organism, and assumes that the Church derives her life from her members, and that she is constituted in her unity and catholicity as a living body by the combination of the several parts, or that the central cell is created by the organism, not the organism by the central or organic cell, which is as much as to say, multiplicity can exist without unity to produce it, or that dead or unliving parts can generate life and activity." The mistake here comes from confounding a free, ethical, unity, with the unity of a blind organism in nature. The unity of the Church is before, and in order to, the parts. This we hold. But the unity here exists primarily in the law of its life, and not in an outward form, complete, and at hand. The type exists ideally in the law of its life, before it comes to outward expression.

The unity of the Roman Church does violence to the ethical freedom of its members. Not because it stands in one See, or in one bishop, called pope. This might be proper enough, provided it did not make the outward and formal, to rule the inward and spiritual, so as to do violence to it. A monarchy is not necessarily a tyranny or a despotism, but it always is such where the relation between the ruling power and the subjects, the law and obedience is not free.

The unity which the Anglican high-church party seeks is the same in kind as that of the Romanist. It makes the unity to inhere primarily in an outward order, and where this seems to come short, they would supplement it by an outward intercommunication or correspondence between what it calls the branches of the one Catholic church.

The common Protestant theory produces a dualism between the two sides of the Church, the visible and the invisible, the ideal and the actual. The invisible Church they say is one, but the visible Church is divided. This destroys the true nature of the Church, and leaves it, as to its visible, earthly state, a mere society. Hence the unity which the large body of Protestants seek after, is a unity which *they are to make*, by bringing together the parts in the way of correspondence.

We hold unity to be a necessary attribute of the Church, without which it could not be what it is. Separation from its unity is death. But we do not believe that the form of its unity is fixed and unalterable. The unity of the Church is an object of faith,—it is a part of the mystery of the Church itself. As such it is not the product of human reason or human will, nor the result simply of a combination or union of parts, but it is the actualization, in a form adapted to the law of its life, of the unity which holds in the ideal Church. It is a unity which first of all apprehends us, just as in our natural birth we are apprehended by the common life of the race, and then we are to apprehend it. Thus the life-processes and the ethical processes continually flow together. Hence the actual form of the Church's unity may change, while the unity of life remains unchanged. We have said that Protestantism did not break with the life of the holy Catholic Church. It had its birth in the warm bosom of this life. Neither was it a mere negative protest against the errors and corruptions of Rome, as though the mediæval history of the Church, was a mere blank as to any positive development in the life of the Church. It did not seek merely to return to the purer condition of primitive Christianity. This we have shown could not be. But its very negation was the result of a positive life and power at work, in the strength of which only it was able to protest against error and corruption. This is too much overlooked by the Anglican Catholics. They see only the negative side of Protestantism. They shrink from the abuse of freedom which they behold on every side, and, forgetting the positive life which inheres in the Protestant movement, they give up in despair, and seek to revive (rather repristinate) early Christianity.

In all this they overlook, we believe, how much they themselves owe to Protestantism. Without it the problems of Christian history would be, even for them, far darker than they are, when assailed by Rome. Their only defence is in the use of Protestant weapons. Thus in the *Pastoral Address* issued by the House of Bishops at their last convention in New York, they say: "To His ministers thus weak and subject to error,

He hath given His infallible word, that, without peril of misleading their flock, they may instruct them with all authority by speaking always according to the Scriptures." Just as necessarily must they appeal also to that other principle of Protestantism, Justification by Faith, if they would escape from a form of Christian life which once tended to bondage.

We rejoice that the Anglican Church has done so much to bring vividly before the view of the Protestant world, the rich treasures of primitive Christianity. The Reformed Church has labored in the same work. The old Christological faith, and the old order of worship have been brought forward as *our* inheritance. We feel above all that Protestantism needs to find the beginnings of its life in that one Catholicity which formed the original, rich, fountain of the Church's life. But we would commune with it as Protestants, and seek to strengthen ourselves as Protestants in its broader principles and faith. We would not renounce Protestantism because it has imperfections and weaknesses. The greatness of its work is just in proportion to the greatness of its perils.

What, then, have we to say as to the future of Protestantism? It is unquestionably passing through a terrible crisis. Some may regard it as simple-minded and weak to speak or feel thus. They prefer to shut themselves up in their narrow sectarian confidence, and apply the comforting words, "God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved." But Romanism once applied this same soothing solace to itself. The Church is founded on Peter, and the Roman See is his perpetual bishopric, therefore we cannot be moved. But the storm came, and Romanism *was* moved. Protestantism is only a stage of the Church's life. Every particular movement in history, Christian as well as secular, carries in itself the twofold possibility of success or failure. No one ought to sit down in a blind faith that the problems confronting us will solve themselves. Neither history nor the Church is governed by such blind necessity. Rather would we heed the warning of St. Paul, the apostle to

the Gentiles, "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert graffed in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, the branches were broken off, that I might be graffed in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high minded, but fear. For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest He also spare not thee."

We have faith in Protestantism, but our faith does not blind us to its perils. Our best hope lies in the general movement, showing itself on every hand towards a broader and livelier apprehension of the supernatural character of the Church of Jesus Christ. We look to see the Churchly tendencies in Protestantism rallying and uniting as against the common foe, rationalism, humanitarianism, infidelity. To all workers in this direction we desire to extend the hand of fellowship, but we turn away from any one who repudiates the validity of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Our present limits forbid us to speak further, however, of this part of our subject now, which we have barely touched.

Article VI.—"THE WISDOM OF GOD IN A MYSTERY."

BY D. H. RIDDLE, D. D., MARTINSBURG, W. VA.

It was a lamentation in the time of the Apostle, and so it is yet, that so many who are truly born of God, remain "babes," who must be "fed on milk." Though they are safe, because "born of the Spirit," yet the spiritual is so imperfectly developed, or they are so far from being "perfect," in Paul's sense, that they do not apprehend or appreciate "the deep things of God," though they are "freely given to us" and embodied in the words of Holy Scripture, which the Holy Ghost taught holy men to use, and put on record. "These deep things," in distinction from "the first principles of the doctrine of Christ," constitute what Paul calls "the wisdom of God in a mystery, ordained before the world unto our glory." These "spiritual things" can be received and enjoyed only by spiritual persons or powers. These Paul says, "we speak among them that are perfect;" those whose spiritual tastes and capacities, prepare them for their reception, whom he contrasts with "babes" or "carnal," who must be "fed with milk," because not able to bear or digest stronger food. We have no reason to suppose that persons of this latter class were not Christians. Still they were not "perfect," or full grown. They were not "of full age, who by reason of use, have their senses" or spiritual capacities, "exercised," trained as gymnasts "to discern good and evil." Pastors and teachers, like Paul, should always patiently, give suitable food, "milk for babes." But they should do this, with constant reference to the development and perfection of their spiritual susceptibilities. Especially should those who are set for the defence of the Gospel, be ready to "speak wisdom among the perfect," and from their own attainments, be able to show, that in the "unsearchable riches" of wisdom, there is food

for men, were they only fitted for its reception. Though we have to deal, to a large extent, with "babes and children," because "they are yet carnal and walk as men," yet we should not shrink at proper times, from saying even to "the princes of this world," however intellectually developed, that there is a wisdom, which they do not comprehend, because they are destitute of that discernment or judgment, by which alone it can be perceived; because "these things are spiritually discerned," and not by mere intellect, though mighty as archangel ruined. The reason why men of profound erudition and intense æsthetic cultivation, see no wisdom where Paul saw so much, is not in the nature of the objective truth, but in the subjective condition of the recipient faculty. It is a wisdom, "which none of the princes of this world knew" in Paul's day, and alas! there are living illustrations of the same melancholy fact in our's. The wisdom which Paul was ready always to "speak among the perfect," was not indeed "the wisdom of this world;" nevertheless it *was* wisdom, adapted to exercise the loftiest powers of man, yea, which even "the angels desire to look into," and which "in the ages to come," the manhood of our intellects, will continue to be "unsearchable." It was purposed in the "yesterday" of a past eternity: it is the great idea of "to day," and will be the theme of adoring contemplation "forever."

The large mind and heart of the apostle, though he was a model of a patient "instructor of babes," delighted to dwell on this "wisdom of God in a mystery." Having a clear spiritual intuition of it, in "the full assurance of understanding;" having embraced it, in "the full assurance of faith and hope," as an actual reality, it was his joy and the great labor of his life to bring others to the fellowship of this mystery; and his grief, that he could not make "all men see" it as he did himself. In one of his epistles, he speaks of "the great conflict," literally agony of desire, he had that his converts might come to "all riches of the full assurance of understanding," which he considers equivalent to "the acknowledgment" or full recognition of this mystery. No doubt, he often wondered at and wept over their slowness of heart; hence he prayed so much and

earnestly in reference to this point.* He was especially sad, that those who had begun aright, were "bewitched" and seduced to go back to "the beggarly elements of the world," instead of going forward to higher attainments.

We may learn Paul's conception of the term "mystery" from the explanatory phrases he uses in connection with it, in his Epistles generally, and especially in the passage which has suggested these thoughts. He calls it that "which from the beginning of the world, hath been hid in God;" "which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men:" "hid from ages and generations;" "kept secret since the world began." Here he calls it "the hidden wisdom," "ordained before the world" or ages "unto our glory." Along with these expressions, however, he connects another aspect very distinctly, viz: that it is now "made known," "manifested," "revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." It was something, therefore, perfect in the Eternal idea and intended ultimately for full development, but gradual in its evolution: "Hid in God before the world began," but which was to have the cycles of our time, as the period, and our world as the theatre of its manifestation: ordained in His wisdom "for our glory" as well as His own.

This mystery may be viewed in two aspects, of a Person and a plan, though these mutually involve each other. The plan, having primary reference, in all its parts to the person. This constitutes what in our version is called "the intent"† for which God created all things, that there might be a theatre for the gradual manifestation, of the mystery of a Person, according to an Eternal plan.

---

* See the prayer in Ephesians i. 15, 18,—where he prays that they may have "the spirit of wisdom and revelation, in the knowledge," acknowledgment, or as before full recognition "of Him." And also Colossians i. 9. 2 Thess. ii. 11.

† This seems to be the true meaning of the particle used by the apostle, "in order that"—or "to the end that." Certainly Creation had an end, beyond the manifestation of power, or a medium through which "His Eternal power and Godhead," might be "understood," though this is one of its uses, and proves atheism or pantheism to be irrational.

So far as this mystery relates to a person, the apostle leaves us in no doubt as to his conception of it. It was "the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh." The glorious forthshining and perfect representation of the invisible and otherwise incomprehensible Jehovah. "The pillar and ground of the truth," and beyond all question, the great mystery. This divine idea, this decree or purpose,* according to the Westminster Catechism, or "the good pleasure of His will," according to Paul, is actualized or executed, in the works of Creation and Providence, but the ultimate ground of all, is the self-manifestation of the Godhead, in the person of Jesus Christ our Lord. In this "the wisdom of God in a mystery," centres itself and by this it is revealed. "The Gospel of God, which He promised afore, by the prophets," is, "concerning His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord," in the mystery of His person in two natures, "made of the seed of David according to the flesh," or human nature, and "declared to be the Son of God, with power, by the resurrection from the dead, according to the Spirit of Holiness," or the Divine: "manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit." It is noticeable that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in deploring their incapacity to comprehend, what he was anxious to communicate, refers especially to this mystery of the Person of Christ; "of whom," he says, "we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered," or unsuited to your present capacities, "seeing ye are dull of hearing." Then, in urging them to go on to perfection, he proceeds to set forth the mystery of His Person, as prefigured in Melchisedec. From the use of this particular personage, as prefiguring the Person of Christ, we easily arrive at the generalization, that, not only all the representative personages, of the old Economy, but all its types and shadows, predictions and promises, have the same reference. The substance of all is Christ, the central object, which threw back a dim shadow, even to the gates of Eden, and then more accurate resemblances of the reality, even to "the fullness of times."

---

* "His Eternal purpose, according to His good pleasure, whereby, for His own glory, He hath fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass."

He was "the seed of the woman," "the seed of Abraham, in whom all nations were to be blessed," "the Shiloh" of Judah's line, "the Lord and Son of David." The genius of prophecy, is "the testimony of Jesus," not always fully comprehended by the prophets themselves, to whom this much was revealed, that all was to be real and actual in the future. In a word, the Person of Christ, as the manifestation of the hidden wisdom, is the end of Creation, the key of Providence, the sum of Revelation. He is "the first-born of every creature," having the right of primogeniture to the whole creation; "in all things" and over all beings "having pre-eminence;" "the head of the body, the Church," and "head over all things, to the Church;" "Alpha and Omega, beginning and end." Whatever manifestations of His infinite perfections, it may have pleased God, to make in the ages preceding our world, the Eternities of the past, and whatever it may please Him to manifest hereafter, in the Eternities of the future, this is "the good pleasure of His will, according to the purpose He has purposed in Himself," in reference to our world and our age; "The Eternal ideal ground," on which "the world as an actual, temporal world rests," as one has beautifully suggested.*

So far as "the wisdom of God in a mystery," is regarded in the aspect of a plan, it has reference in every part to this person, either in His first or second coming. "The mystery of His will, as made known," and to be accomplished in "the dispensation of the fullness of times," is the recapitulation of all things, in Him, who was "made of a woman, made under the law," "made for a little while lower than the angels," but ultimately to have all things put under Him. "The intent for which God created all things, and for which he pre-arranged all the cycles,"† was "in Christ Jesus our

---

* On this thought of Lange, Tayler Lewis remarks, "We have placed this sentence in italics, as containing a truth of vast importance, transcending all science, on the one hand, and all theology, that places itself in antagonism to science on the other."

† This is rendered "the Eternal purpose:" more literally, the pre-arrangement of the ages or cycles, as in Hebrews, "the ages were framed," fitted into each other, "by the word of God."—Heb. xi. 3.

Lord," that "now," in our time, "might be known, His manifold wisdom, unto principalities and powers in heavenly places, through the Church,"* the body of which this Person is the Head. "Whatsoever comes to pass:" whatsoever exists in Creation, or occurs in Providence, has reference to this purpose. All was formed, is sustained and controlled, in subordination to this end. The wheels of Providence, in the evolution of this great plan, are so "high," and their motion so slow, that even believers, amidst the clatter and clamor of secondary agencies, sometimes become impatient and distrustful. But as this plan, after being hid in God, for thousands of years, was actualized in the first manifestation of Jesus Christ in the flesh, so "in His time," He will show its consummation, in His second coming; "the regeneration," "the restitution of all things," when "the mystery of God shall be finished," according to the original idea; when the temple, made of living stones, taken from the ruins of the apostacy, in successive ages, shall be completed from foundation to top-stone: when the Bride shall be prepared for the Eternal Bridegroom and the praises of this plan and its author, shall occupy the coming Eternity, and all else be forgotten.

From this view of the meaning of the apostle in the use of these terms, we may see how fully he was justified, in saying "Howbeit we speak wisdom." We are thus able, also, to place "the wisdom of God, in the riches of the glory of this mystery," in contrast with "the wisdom of the world," in the adaptation of each, to exercise and develope the profoundest intellects. The wisdom of the world, regards nature, "the things that are made," Creation. The wisdom of God, regards the Person, "by whom and for whom, all things were created and in whom they all consist;" have their centre of unity and great End. One studies the building, the other the builder. So

---

*It is "a false idea that the Church is for the world, and not the world for the Church," as false in theology and the philosophy of history, as the geocentric theory distinguished from the heliocentric in astronomy. This false hypothesis, in one case, will as little explain the mystery of God's plan, as the other theory, the solar system.

again, the wisdom of the world studies history, the events or occurrences of time and their secondary agencies and human factors. The wisdom of God leads us to the knowledge of a great plan, in accordance with which, these events take place. One deals with facts, the other with ideas. In ignorance or rejection of the wisdom of God, the events of our world in the history of our race, seem like a succession of mighty abortions, from the builders of Babel down to our times; from the Nimrods of the immediately post-diluvian age, down to the Napoleons of to-day. Without the light derived from the wisdom of God, what a phantasmagoria is the past, where the glory of Egyptian wisdom, the treasures of Grecian art, and the majesty of Roman power, appear as transient figures in the field of vision, and pass away "like foam on the water." Hence, how utterly baffled is "the wisdom of the world," in attempting a satisfactory solution of the ever recurring question of the *wherefore* of the world; why it ever came into existence, and is continued, and what is to be "the end of these things." The wisdom of the world makes everything of man, and his glory. In the other wisdom, God only is great and His glory everything. In the wisdom of the world, the end of Creation and Providence, if recognized at all, is universal liberty, perfection in science, social enjoyment or civil institutions. In the wisdom of God, these are incidents, collateral results, secondary agencies. If subservient to His great plan, and used for His glory and the service of His church, perpetuated, otherwise, like besoms or axes thrown away or superseded. "All nations," except as its individuals are united to the person of Christ and become living stones in the great temple, "are less than nothing and vanity," scaffoldings to be put away, the chaff of the threshing.* In the wisdom of the world, our age, the life time of the race,

* "To the divine eye or to the mind that guided the Biblical inspiration, human politics, whether of monarchies or republics, and all human political changes *in themselves considered* or out of this visible relation" (to the church), "must be very insignificant things. Judged by this rule, Trojan wars, Peloponnesian wars, or the wars of Buonaparte, fall in importance below the wars of Canaan, or Hiram's sending cedar rafts to Joppa to aid Solomon in the construction of the temple."—*Tayler Lewis.*

and each of its successive circles, is magnificent and glorious. In the wisdom of God, the whole is a little episode in the eternities; our thousands of years, are "but as yesterday when it is gone, or a watch in the night." "A thousand years as one day." Our revolutions and catastrophes, so mighty to us, are but transient elevations or depressions in that flood, by which we are all carried away, by Him who "is from everlasting to everlasting." The glory of one age, and its achievements and its actors, are forgotten in the following. "All flesh is grass." Systems, schools, human projects, flourish and fade, and pass away. But "the word of the Lord," "by which we understand, the ages were framed," so that the invisible might appear in the phenomenal, the Eternal plan, "endureth forever," stretching from beginning to end; all-embracing, all-controlling.

The apostle Paul, most probably, was acquainted with the wisdom of the world. We infer from his education, and his incidental references and allusions, that he had studied what "the princes of the world" had taught. He was, therefore, prepared intelligently to compare its wisdom and the wisdom of God and thus to prefer what on examination proved excellent or superior; and after this comparison, he not only affirmed the "excellency" of this wisdom, but was willing to count all things, loss for its attainment; not only as a sinner, as we all are, who needed salvation as we all do, but as a man of intellect, who needed food for his mind he found satisfaction. in the mystery unfolded in revelation, and only there. Such ought to be the case with all who believe in the wisdom of God and would be if it were fully comprehended.

But do not professed believers in this wisdom of God, and sometimes even its chosen advocates, shrink from a comparison of it, with that of the world, in the point of view presented by the apostle, viz.: its adaptation to exercise and develop the powers of human intellect and to fill up our instinctive cravings after knowledge? This has the appearance of modesty; but may it not, in some cases, spring from a consciousness of our imperfect attainments? May it not be, from a failure to comprehend "the length, and breadth, and depth, and height" of this wisdom ourselves, that we admire, but so seldom really occupy the

attitude of the apostle in his triumphant challenge, "Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of the world?" by the revelation of His own. Should we not always be ready to say to the boasters or the scoffers, who parade "philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, the elements of the world," "Howbeit we speak wisdom?" And if we are not able to do this, should we not inquire into the reasons of our incapacity, and see whether it is not our sin as well as misfortune?

In this connection, it may be well to recur to the apostle's explanation of the carnality and consequent spiritual incapacity of the Corinthians. He says, "Whereas there is among you envying and strife, and divisions or factions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?" And more specifically. "While one saith I am of Paul, another, I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal?" hence he "could not speak unto them as to spiritual, but as unto babes in Christ." In this undue magnification of unessentials and glorification of human names and authority, this exaggeration of points of difference, practically overshadowing points of agreement, have we not a portrait of the spirit of the sect, which now says, I am of Luther, I am of Calvin, I am of Wesley? And if the same essential spirit pervades alike the older, and new phrases, do not they equally evidence carnality and serve to explain the incapacity for the reception of the higher forms of spiritual truth, manifest in those who have a bigoted attatchment to their own peculiarities? It seems to be a law of our nature, that absorption in trifles begets mental triviality or dwarfishness, as microscopic habits make a myops. If the body of Christ ever comes to keep "the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace," there must be an increase of spirituality, and thereby of capacity to appreciate the great vitals, in which Christians agree, and consequently a diminished estimate of points of distinction, and mere human authority. When Christians become "perfect" in Paul's sense, "strong men," they will become "one" in a blessed sense, also; the sense of the Saviour. Whatever may be the result of these yearnings after union, like "the earnest expectation of the creature," it is certain that *unity* which is a different and more

excellent thing would be the issue of greater spirituality, and deeper insight into "the wisdom of God in a mystery." Unity in the knowledge of the Son of God, the common possession of Eternal life, would bring us into fellowship with each other.*

Analogous in influence to the spirit of sect, is that of undue verbal criticism and systematizing in theology. Paul says, "We have not received the spirit which is of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we may know the things which are freely given us of God." Just so far then, as the spirit now alluded to, is of the world, worldly—its tendency is to incapacitate us to know "the things of the Spirit." And have there not been, and are there not now, illustrations of the possibility of the combination of keenest powers of verbal criticism, and admirable capacities for systematizing, with the saddest lack of spiritual apprehension? "The letter killeth, the Spirit only giveth life." "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," largeness of view and deeper insight into the meaning of the words, which the Holy Ghost uses. "*Qui hæret in litera, hæret in cortice.*" There is both a shell and a kernel in Revelation. So too in the process of systematizing, very important in its place, there is almost necessarily, a narrowing down of the immensities, to logical forms. Hence, in giving systematic form to the truths which lie scattered through the field of Revelation, "the spirit of the world," through the love of logical symme-

---

* "Be it truth or be it fable
That in thousand books is shown,
All is but a tower of Babel
Unless love shall make them one."

Göethe as quoted by Lange.

† The special peril here is, the substitution of demonstrative or speculative faith in a beautiful and harmonious system, which commends itself to the logical faculty, as beautiful demonstrations in mathematics, for faith in the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have known instances in which the ground of personal safety was placed in the "belief of the doctrine of justification by faith." Yet it is possible to believe that this is the true and only ground of salvation without exercising justifying faith, "by which we receive," not a doctrine "but a person;" the Lord Jesus Christ, "and rest upon Him alone," and not on the orthodoxy of our creed, "for salvation." So there is a true and false theory of atonement. Yet a true theory of the atonement may be held and vindicated with great logical power, without personal faith in Him who made it, and we can imagine that a man whose theory of the atonement is erroneous or defective according to Anselm, may yet be actually conciled by embracing its glorious author as his Saviour.

try, may unconsciously usurp the place of "the Spirit which is of God."* The wisdom of God is seen not only in the words which His Spirit has selected but in the mode of His teaching. Without being caught up into paradise; while consciously "in the body" and yet "in the spirit," in communion with the spirit of revelation, the words of Scripture may have a meaning, which no forms can adequately express. We do not suppose that all truth, besides all necessary to salvation, is contained in any system elaborated by ourselves or elaborated for us by our fathers. If Paul himself, the deep thinker, said, "I count not myself to have apprehended," does it not seem arrogant, to assume or assert, that the whole wisdom of God, is embodied in any of our confessions of faith or systems of theology.* We do not plead for novelties in doctrine, but we do, for deeper insight into the mind of the Spirit, in the unsearchable riches of revelation. The deep things of God, are in the field of revelation, incarnated immutably and sufficiently, in the words which the Holy Ghost taught, all there, as stars in the immensity of space. But if the increased appliances for penetrating space, have revealed what was hidden, in one department of God's works, may not deeper study and profounder insight and increased spirituality bring out more of what hitherto, even till now, has been "hidden wisdom," in the other?

There may be peril too, in such absorbing interest and even activity, in the machinery of Christianity, as leaves no time or disposition for contemplation. There is it is true an extreme of monastic seclusion and a foolish aspiration after angelic perfection and mystical absorption in the Divine. But surely there is an extreme the other way. The true secret of sustained activity may be lost, for the want of meditation. We may here apply the apostle's idea: "Thou bearest not the root, but the root thee." Healthful activity must have its root in deep spirituality, which demands meditation. An age of in-

* Since writing this, I have found an illustration in Tayler Lewis' remarks on "the gift of tongues." Speaking of "the diversities of ecstatic idea or emotion" he says, "Even the utterers could not translate it, into the common logical language of the understanding. They were spoken in the Spirit and only in the Spirit could they be understood." Here I would express my profound sense of obligation to this author, for the notes and excursus with which he has enriched his translation of Lange in Genesis

tense activity, hurry and bustle, first in disposing and then incapacitating teachers and taught, for profounder spiritual apprehension, will sooner or later degenerate into one of carnality, formalism and mechanism. There is danger that "the spirit of the world," through this plausible channel, may come into the Church and thus make our activities useless, with all their noise, by losing connection with their root.* Symmetrical piety, is only attained by the harmony of the inward and outward, the activity which springs from fellowship with the things of the Spirit, working and walking in the light.* Paul was a model of earnest activity: "in labors more abundant," than any other apostle or Christian of any age. "His was," as one says, "the calmness of intensity, the nature of the human mind, forbidding it to be more and the character of the individual forbidding it to be less." But this marvellous activity, was prompted and sustained by deep acquaintance with the mystery of God, spiritual apprehensions of spiritual things, by which he judged all things and all forms of professed wisdom, and yet was judged by no man, and could be understood and imitated only by those who had drunk deep from the same fountain.

We are persuaded that the best antidote to the spirit of sect and the best means of promoting genuine catholicity of feeling; the best corrective of undue literalizing and systematizing, would be found in deeper study of this "wisdom of God in a mystery." So too the person who has laid hold of this great plan of God, and has it entrenched in his convictions, and feels himself privileged to be a worker together with God, will be a patient and active worker, in any sphere however humble whether his visible influence be great or small. Likewise he will be in little danger of being plundered of the steadfastness of his faith, or diverted from his patient labors by the plausibilities of human "philosophy and vain deceit." He will not be moved from his steadfast hope, by the hosannas offered to

---

* In the Spirit breathed and the utterances made, in some of our popular conventions, there is enough to awaken apprehensions on this point, among thoughtful minds. Yet there is so much to commend in the zeal and earnestness of such persons, that it is hard to protest, and still harder to oppose. It is to be hoped, that while some are called to work the machinery, there are others less noticed, that are faithful in pleading for the power of God.

the science of the age and the discoveries of men, who are weaving the spider's web or hatching the egg of the cockatrice in popular literature. With full conviction in his understanding and faith in his heart, as to the objective truth and infinite excellence of Revelation, he can smile with compassion, and will need grace to keep him, from a feeling of derision in view of the cavils and "higher criticism" of the age, which would legislate from the world a personal Jehovah and from the word a personal manifestation of God in the flesh, the modern antichrist, "denying the Father and the Son." He will be prepared for even the incarnation of "the mystery of iniquity," which we are led to expect will be coincident with the last appearing of the glory of the great God even our Saviour and the full actualization of "the wisdom of God in a mystery." In the "perilous times" yet to come, the day of trial when that wicked shall be revealed, "whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and deceivableness of unrighteousness," by means of perishing objects, plausibilities addressed to the taste or ambition of men, those only will stand the test, who are vitally united to the person of Christ, "rooted and built up in him," "steadfast by faith." Others, with no such anchorage, childishly delighted with mere forms or fighting for unessentials, will go with the current and course and spirit of the world, whatever direction it may hereafter assume. As "the mystery of godliness," in its eminent sense is the person of Christ, so, in the sense of personal salvation, it is vital union to Him, through the medium of the word and a participation of His life, by the power of His indwelling Spirit. "Christ in us the hope of glory."

ART. VII.—PREACHING.

BY REV. GEO. LEWIS STALEY, A.M., ST. JOHN'S, NEAR PETERSVILLE, MD.

THE pulpit is one of the most potent instrumentalities in the general education of the people, apart from its special and proper mission in the proclamation of the gospel. So intimate and vital, indeed, are its relations to large masses of people, in this view, and so regular and constant are its influences, that, if there were no higher considerations involved, it would be matter of vast moment, that its ministrations should be so conducted, as to produce the largest and most beneficial results. But when we take into the account, the magnitude of the interterests with which it is charged *exclusively* in the kingdom of God as a new and supernatural order of things in the world, comprehending all that belongs to the redemption of man and the cosmical order of which he is the crowning head, the importance of this subject presents itself in colossal proportions to our thoughts. What to preach, and how to preach, so as most effectually to accomplish the ends of this Divine Institute—as we shall presently show it to be—become questions of absorbing interest to those who are called and commissioned, to be the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God. (1 Cor. iv. 1). In truth, there seems to be, in these evil and degenerate times upon which we have fallen, a special demand for an earnest consideration of this subject, when so much of what passes current now, for the preaching of the gospel, is, in large part, either canting sentimentalism—sensational display—elaborate essay or metaphysical speculation about "systems of truth," interspersed with what may be properly characterized as passing, complimentary allusions to the person and work of our Lord,—all in such strange contrast with that simple, unvarnished, authoritative statement of "the truth as it is in Jesus," for which apostles and apostolic men, in the early Christian ages, were so eminently distinguished.

For the purpose of bringing up the entire subject in detail, we propose, in the first place, to set forth, as a primary and essential element of it, that

PREACHING IS A DIVINE INSTITUTE.

In many quarters of our common Protestantism, where the formality of ordination is still observed, and where a higher conception of the office might be expected to obtain, the ministry of the word is practically regarded as a mere profession—only higher and nobler than our ordinary secular professions, because it is concerned with higher and nobler things, and proposes the accomplishment of grander ends than these. For the general popular mind, indeed, there seems to be no higher conception of the office than this of a profession, and thus it comes to pass, after the old proverb, "like people, like priests," that the mission and work of the preacher is conducted on the plane of mere humanitarianism, and degenerates, not unfrequently, into a commonplace agency for the moral instruction or literary entertainment of the people.

As over against this wide spread-view, we set forth, that the preaching of the gospel, as distinguished from all other modes of presentation, is a Divine Institute, supernatural in its origin, and carries in itself supernatural powers and resources for its own specific ends, and so, is entirely independent of the helps of what is commonly called human eloquence. Without intending or wishing in any way to disparage or undervalue the accomplishments of fine rhetoric or a genuine eloquence, when allowed to play the part of handmaids to the grand office of Preaching, we unhesitatingly assert, that the simple, unadorned and positive announcements of the pulpit carry in themselves a "truly supernatural power and force." It would be easy enough, indeed, to illustrate and confirm this assertion by reference to the history of the pulpit, from the primitive centuries, when its ministry was committed, for the most part, to men who in the matter of rhetorical and educational accomplishments seemed but illy qualified for the work, down through the Christian ages, as these bear overwhelming testimony to the grand truth, that it is not by might nor by power in any human form whether of eloquence,

or learning, or philosophy, that its work is done, but by the Spirit of the Lord as organically bound to the office of the ministry of the Word. Let St. Paul's testimony, however, be sufficient, when, writing to the brethren at Corinth, where the gospel, through his instrumentality had achieved such wonderful results, he declares: And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with *excellency of speech or of wisdom*, declaring unto you the testimony of God. For I determined to know nothing among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. And I was with you in weakness, and in fear and in much trembling. And my speech and preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." (1 Cor. ii. 1–5).

It needs only that we consider that the new creation brought into this fallen order, growing as it does organically from our Lord's Person and Work, as divine, and yet most truly human, is a supernatural order in the bosom of the natural, all whose organs and functions are of like character, and utter themselves from the same high plane. The kingdom of Heaven, in this view, is not an abstraction—a creation of thought or a convenient name for the aggregate of certain spiritual powers and forces, but a divine-human organism—a concrete reality—an order of grace and glory—a Body Mystical in which Christ now dwells and reigns, and in which the supernatural and divine is ever seeking through and by human organs, to diffuse its regenerating power, and give the harmonies of the celestial order "a local habitation in the earth." It lies, therefore, in the very nature of the Christian redemption, that all Christians, as baptized into Christ and partakers of his anointing, (Why art thou called a Christian? Heid. Cate. Quest. 32) live, move and have their being in the bosom of this divine life and participate in its prophetical, priestly and kingly offices for the respective spheres they are called to fill. They constitute thus, "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people." (1 Pet. ii. 9). In a still higher sense, is it true of those, whom the Lord calls to be His ministers, and commissions to proclaim the

glad tidings that the kingdom of Heaven is at hand, that they, as his organs, represent Him in the prophetical, priestly and royal functions of his work, and are clothed with special qualifications for their proper performance. The ministry of our Lord is in some sense to be repeated and reproduced in the ministrations of those whom He calls to this special form of service, so that each office may have its proper place, and its duties be faithfully discharged. The prophetical may not, without serious detriment, be absorbed or displaced by the priestly and the kingly; neither may the prophetical absorb and displace these (as is unfortunately the case in most of our Protestant communities) without most disastrous results in the matter of our salvation. Each office must be duly honored, and allowed to discharge its appropriate function in harmony with the others, if we would have the ministry of Jesus perpetuated in the Church. "All that Jesus began both to do and teach" (Acts i. 1) in the gospel, He continues to do and teach in the acts of his apostles. The Parable of the Sower, sowing the seed, which is the Word of God, is of continuous significance for the Christian ages; for the field is the world in its entire extent, both of time and space. The personal ministry of our Lord, as regards the office of teaching, is of perennial force for all time, and is the living ground in which the ministry of the Word is rooted, and that imparts to it whatever of force and power its ministrations carry. The vast significance of the work of preaching the gospel of the kingdom of Heaven may be inferred from the fact, that from the beginning to the close of his earthly history, our Lord never ceased to preach—always and everywhere teaching, exhorting and rebuking, with all long-suffering and patience. From the time of the Temptation in the Wilderness, Jesus began to preach and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand, going through all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues. He preached the gospel, (Matt. iv. 17, et sq.), continuously, all His life long, on through the great forty days, "during which he spoke of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God."

What He did, He trained His Disciples to do. Receiving the truth from His lips, they were sent forth to *preach.* Besides the Twelve, he appointed other seventy also, giving them a like commission, adding, "Into whatsoever city ye enter and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say: Even the very dust of your city which cleaveth to us, we do wipe off as a testimony against you: notwithstanding, be ye sure of this, *the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you* . . . He that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me." (St. Luke x. 10, et sq). And when about to leave the world, He spake unto them saying, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth; go ye *therefore and teach all nations,* baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo! I am with you always even unto the end of the world." And then, as if to seal the supernatural character of this permanent Institute in His kingdom, He adds: "Behold I send the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye *be endued with power from on high.*" And so, when the time was fulfilled, and the day of Pentecost had fully come, with its grandest of all miracles, the Holy Ghost baptizing them with a Divine fire, by which, they who as yet were only an aggregation of individual Disciples, were fused into one Body, which ever after should be the fullness of Him that filleth all in all, they went forth into the world as the accredited organs of this supernatural constitution, from the bosom of which they proclaimed the news of salvation to perishing men. In the consciousness of a divine vocation, armed with a divine commission, and with the full knowledge of their place in the Body Mystical of their Lord, as the organs of His Presence, they entered upon their work, doing by "the foolishness of preaching" those "greater works," of which Jesus spake, (St. John xiv. 12), removing the mountains of difficulty that loomed up before them, and starting the world, in all the departments of its life, upon a new course of history, to issue ultimately in its complete regeneration.

In this connection, and as illustrating and confirming the view we have taken of this subject, it is worthy of notice, how exclusively in the Scriptures, the generation of faith and the beginnings of the Christian life are associated with the preaching of the gospel. The uniform mode of representation as regards this particular, is, that of teaching and hearing. "Whosoever *heareth* these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken unto, &c." "Whosoever calleth on the name of the Lord, shall be saved. How shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not *heard?* And how shall they *hear without a preacher? . . . So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God.*" (Rom. x. 13, et sq). Passages bearing with emphasis upon this point might be indefinitely multiplied, but they will readily suggest themselves to those who are familiar with the language of the Holy Scriptures. Catching its inspiration from these lively oracles of God, and as if to bear its testimony to this Divine Institute, as necessary for the propagation of the Christian religion in all ages, the Heidelberg Catechism asks and answers thus: "Since we (Quest. 65) are made partakers of Christ and all His benefits by faith only, *whence* doth this faith proceed? From the Holy Ghost, who works faith in my heart by the *preaching of the gospel* and confirms it by the use of the sacraments." Indeed so entirely and exclusively is the fact set forth in the Scriptures and illustrated and confirmed by such overwhelming testimony in the missionary work of the gospel in all past ages, that "*faith comes by hearing*"—is propagated by voice of the living apostle, who is, as it were, the bearer of the divine life—that one cannot help wondering how it has come to pass, that in the minds of so many Christian people, Bible and Tract Societies, Sunday Schools, Christian Associations (young men's) and other similar agencies are regarded as fully competent to do this great work, if indeed they are not more competent than those who have an apostle's commission. Good and useful as all these institutions are as subordinate helps, whenever and wherever they are even tacitly allowed to usurp or discredit

the divine office of the ministry, they have already surrendered themselves into the hands and are doing the work of Anti-christ, by virtually denying that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, and is now, through His servants, Himself teaching the nations the blessed gospel of His kingdom.

There is, moreover, a natural basis upon which this office rests, in the very organization of our being. It is not by the eye (as in seeing or reading) but by the ear that there is the nearest and easiest entrance into the hidden depths of the soul's life. The vibrations or wave sounds of the air (Pneuma) undoubtedly possess a certain intrinsic fitness for the conveying to the ear of that noblest part of our organization, the spirit, (Pneuma) through the outward ear, of those higher truths which determine and shape our destiny, as taught by the Holy Ghost (Pneuma) through the preaching of the gospel. It cannot be denied, that a sense of such mysterious correspondences in the natural and spiritual spheres of our being, has always existed in the consciousness of men in every age and in all stages of civilization, and has crystallized itself in the best and noblest words of their languages. It must, however, suffice for our present purpose to say, that the peculiarity of which we now speak, is clearly recognized in the Scriptures, and, as we have said is the basis in nature upon which this supernatural institution is founded. That "hearing" which St. Paul says, comes "by the Word of God," is just this mysterious entrance of the truth into our inmost life, carried thither by the living voice of those who are sent to preach, and which authenticates itself to humble and susceptible souls, as of divine authority.

Well might St. Paul magnify his office, with which in point of dignity and importance, the whole world presents nothing worthy of comparison; and well would it be for these times, if ministers were of the apostle's mind in this particular, disdaining all compromises with the world and proclaiming the gospel, regardless of fear, favor or affection, in the name and for the love of the Lord, whose commission they bear.

Such being the nature of the ministry of the Word, we turn attention now to the consideration of the proper order of its

teaching, or the method in which the facts and truths of the gospel may be most fitly and successfully exhibited. Without doubt, for one who seriously ponders the matter, the mind of the ancient Church and of our immediate spiritual ancestry was, in this particular, far in advance of the habit into which our modern pulpit has fallen, because they in their profounder faith followed, as the order and method of their teachings,

THE ORDER OF THE CHRISTIAN YEAR,

as the most natural and successful way of instructing the people, as we shall now undertake to show.

How singular the contrast between their practice and the now almost universal custom of ministers—even in quarters where, from "a priori" considerations we should expect to find a different state of things—to preach from texts and themes accidentally or arbitrarily selected, (and sometimes furnished by a curious parishioner, whose particular whim must be gratified), for the edification or entertainment of their congregations. And how strange a medley too, would a collection of the texts (odd ends of Scripture) and themes, which make up the staple of any given year's pulpit instructions, present, without connection or order of any sort, and for which a parallel could be found in no other department of literary labor! Such a collection, particularly if made from the Saturday announcements in our city papers, in whose advertising columns our sensational clergymen are wont to publish their curious wares for the benefit of those who may properly be called the nomads of our Christian communities, going always where the most attractive bill is presented—would be in the highest degree amusing, if the subject were not too serious to be handled in such way. The Professor, who in his lectures upon any branch of historical or philosophical study, would pursue a like haphazard course of instruction, without organic or logical order, might possibly amuse and entertain, but would certainly fail to make any very definite or intelligent impression upon the minds of his pupils, or excite any enthusiastic interest in his particular department. The prime importance

of order and method, indeed, is universally admitted in all the inferior spheres of educational work; and no one will question the truth of the assertion, that impressions will be always clear and well defined, and instruction positive and valuable, in any branch of learning or science, in proportion, as the method of presentation corresponds with the order of its organic development.

Surely it cannot be otherwise in the ministry of the Divine Word. It is a mere truism to say, that the more orderly, in its continuity, the method of pulpit instruction—the more nearly it corresponds, in its *re*presentations with the historical verities, with whose proclamation, it is charged, the more vivid and graphic and lifelike will be the impressions left upon the minds and hearts of those who hear. "This is life eternal," says St. John, "to know Thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent," and therefore we insist, that the preaching of the gospel has for its sole and exclusive object the authoritative setting forth of the truth as revealed and embodied in Jesus, through knowledge of whom only we can know God and have eternal life. Mere discussions of doctrine or dissertations in regard to what the sacred writers in certain passages did or did not mean, is surely not what the Divine office of preaching in its original institution contemplated. The gospel of our Lord is not merely, or mainly, or indeed in any sense what it is so generally called, "a system of truth"—a congeries of theological speculations and deductions to be held in the mind as a belief—but a challenge of faith to the stupendous fact, "that Jesus Christ *is* come in the flesh," "that the Son of God *is* come," not in a past age simply, as something to be devoutly remembered and piously cherished in our thoughts, but as a *perennial mystery*—a present fact for all ages—the same yesterday, to-day and forever. "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?" is the grand question which our Lord is continually asking, and to which there is but that one answer, the substance of which had been wrought into the very texture of St. Peter's being, and uttered itself from his inmost consciousness, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." The mighty mystery which

confronted St. Peter and his fellow disciples in their daily intercourse and association with Him, gradually and imperceptibly to themselves, working itself as a faith into their hearts and minds, confronts us no less really now than it did these faithful men in the days of His flesh, challenging our faith, that we also, "beholding the glory of the Lord as in a glass, may be changed thereby into the same image from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord." And just this is the significance and aim of the Christian Year, by its ceaseless commemorations in Festival and Fast, to bring us in faith, through Gospel and Epistle, into actual communion with our Lord, as personally, though mystically present with us, in the flesh. It needs only superficial knowledge of the structure and organism of the Church Year, to see how from beginning to end—from Christmas to the Second Advent, there is underlying all but one grand movement—an Epiphany beginning with the glories of the Sacred Infancy, repeating itself with ever increasing magnificence through all the stages of His life until it reaches its full consummation in the victory of Easter and the majesty of His Ascension glory. The splendors of Whitsuntide are a new Epiphany—constituting the beginning of a nobler manifestation, a coming in the flesh again, of higher and broader significance, making "the one Catholic Church to be His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all," and destined to consummate itself in that grandest of all Epiphanies, when our Lord shall come in glorious majesty to judge both the quick and dead. Thus far the devotions and commemorations of the Christian Year, move exclusively amidst the objective realities of the Christian Redemption, but with Trinity Sunday, there begins a new movement, which is concerned mainly with the manifestations of our Lord's glory subjectively in the hearts and lives of those who are the members of His mystical body. It is not the revelation of the Holy Trinity (which has already been completed in the coming of the Holy Ghost) that we are called to celebrate in the devotions of this Festival, but rather, as the subjective side of this revelation, our baptism "into the mystery of the ever adorable Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, by which being

born of water and of the Spirit, we are formed into His image here and fitted to rise to His blissful presence hereafter."* It is thus that the glory of Christmas is manifested subjectively in our lives—Christ born in us the hope of glory—and which will consummate itself also subjectively in our resurrection and glorification at the second Advent, when "we shall be like Him, because we shall see Him as He is." And so all through its devotions, for those who have ears to hear this magnificent refrain of the Epiphany, the manifestation of our Lord's glory, is ever repeating and reproducing itself from Sunday to Sunday until it is swallowed up and lost finally in the realities of the Second Advent itself.

Such being the significance of the Christian Year—all its teachings and devotions beginning and ending in the person of our Lord, who is thus its Alpha and Omega, it is easy to see, that following its order and method in the ministrations of the pulpit we at once get beyond the limits of that merely abstract gospel now so generally preached, into the warm bosom of the living concrete gospel, and stand face to face with all its wonderful realities as they transpire before us on the arena of that one peculiar history, which was, and is, and is to be, of perennial freshness and significance for the rolling ages. And holding communion thus with our dear Lord in the organic continuity of His earthly life, all the way through from Christmas to Ascension and Whit Sunday, beholding His glory in its manifold objective manifestations, and from Trinity to Advent, as He becomes incarnate, and lives and teaches and works and suffers in His Body, the church, onward towards the time of His Second Advent, when "He shall come to be *glorified* in His saints and admired in all them that believe," His image is not only silently and gradually wrought into the hearts, but is ever coming out more and more distinctly in the lives and characters of His members, and thus it comes to pass, that, beholding the glory of the Lord, we are gradually transfigured by this beatific vision into His blessed likeness.

From these statements, it must follow, that the advantages of this order or method of preaching must be vastly superior

* Collect for Trinity Sunday.

to those afforded by any other method. The people who enjoy this orderly and organic teaching from the lips of an earnest preacher in "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," must and do "grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ," with such depth, and breadth and fulness —with such definiteness and harmony and proportion as can be claimed as the result of no other method. And this because, they are held thus to the contemplation of the Sun of Righteousness, as He moves in glorious majesty, from year to year, along our spiritual heavens, whose light and life-giving beams enter their inmost souls. Even more than this, it is the Master Himself, in the Sacramental Presence of the Altar, teaching now, as in the days of His flesh, those who have obeyed the challenge, "Follow me," that they in like manner, as did St. Peter and his brethren, may come to a like Christian consciousness and the enjoyment of a like Divine benediction. In such way and under such teaching, the faithful and earnest disciple moves year after year, not in an endless circle of repetitions, but in a magnificent spiral, which while repeating itself, is ever mounting higher and higher in the sphere of divine knowledge and the divine life, until "all come in the unity of the Spirit and the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man."

Nor is the advantage and benefit of this order in the ministry of the word, by any means, exclusively on the side of the people. While the preacher, in common with his flock enjoys all the great benefits of this mode of communicating the Gospel of the kingdom, as he has learned it first from the lips and life of the Master, there is to him in this prescript order, resting as it does upon the instincts and intuitions of the Christian consciousness, the immense advantage and benefit of always knowing what to preach. What minister is there anywhere, who does not know, by painful experience, how difficult a thing it is to select suitable texts and themes upon which to base his pulpit instructions for the Sundays as they follow each other in such rapid succession? Hours of precious time are often consumed in the vain and fruitless effort to get some phrase, or verse or topic upon which an elaborate discourse may be

constructed, to satisfy the popular demand for pulpit novelties. And then what anxious and painful thought must be expended in discussing the possible or probable meanings of the sacred text—only to leave the people in a state of such bewilderment and confusion that not unfrequently prompts the question, "What is truth?"

Without doubt, it is just in these very circumstances, that the temptation to indulge in the "sensational" style of preaching, presents itself to the minister, under the plausible assumption, that it is his business "to set forth religious truths or what he considers to be such, in a startling and unexpected form." And when once the temptation is yielded to, the sensational preacher comes to regard it as his exclusive business to keep out of the humdrum routine (as he regards it) of fixed method, in following which there is no room for surprises and the display of clerical ingenuity in the torturing of texts into all manner of fantastic shapes. The old gospel of the church year is too tame and insipid an affair to suit his high-blown conceptions, and though it may not be entirely set aside, it must needs get the smack of originality and novelty, and be adorned with certain meretricious ornaments, in his peculiar handling of it, that those who frequent his ministrations may take the gospel much in the fashion, that they take the sugar-coated pills of *other* quacks. It has been well remarked by an accomplished writer, that "there is no vanity so exorbitant and insatiable as the vanity of the sensational clergyman." And therefore the secular newspapers must, on the previous Saturday, announce the programme of the Sunday's performance, inviting the public to the entertainment, reminding one of similar announcements, which are often seen in the same papers, "Unparalleled attractions at the Broadway, Forrest will give his inimitable personation of Metamora, Positively the last night but one. Performances begin at 8 o'clock precisely." The principle in each case is exactly the same—that of attracting popular attention and securing a full house by the exhibition of novelties. And thus it is that congregations and whole communities are educated to run after

star preachers, as the theatre-going public runs after "star actors." In all such cases, it is much to be feared, that the minister, who allows himself to exercise his office on this low, humanitarian level, has lost out of his faith the true conception of it, as a Divine Institute, in and through which our Lord carries forward His prophetical work in the world by the power of the Holy Ghost, and, whether consciously or not, performs its duties after the manner of a secular profession.

It is not intended, of course, by these remarks to convey the impression, that all preachers who follow the prevailing textual style fall into the temptation to indulge in the sensational, but only, that where there is no underlying and controlling order upon which the instructions of the pulpit are conducted, and each pastor in the exercise of his own individual judgment determines what to preach and when to preach it, there is, for gifted men of a certain temperament, an almost irresistible temptation to fall into this great sin of apostatizing their office and prostituting it to their own little and selfish ends.

On the other hand for those who follow the order of the Christian year in their teachings of their people, there is little if any temptation in the direction alluded to. Besides the fact, that the things to be presented from the pulpit, in one or another of their manifold aspects, are always at hand, confronting us in Gospel and Epistle, there is an educational power in the method for which we plead, by virtue of which those who walk worthy of their vocation, "become so absorbed in what they preach as to have no recollection of themselves." From festival to fast—from Sunday to Sunday, they live and move and have their being in the bosom of that supernatural order, in which Christ now dwells and reigns. They follow their dear Lord from Bethlehem to Olivet, from Whitsuntide to the Second Advent, as He lives and teaches and works and rules in the Church which is His body, by which He will in the end subdue all things unto Himself, always by the force of this habitual communion with Him, growing in their apprehension of that

by which they are apprehended in Christ Jesus. With each return of Christmas and Epiphany, Good Friday and Easter, Ascension and Whitsuntide, the precious mysteries they commemorate appear in some new glory, displaying depths of meaning never before sounded, heights of magnificence never before reached and a Catholicity of which they had never before dreamed. All experience indeed proves, that the earnest preacher, formed after this model, who devoutly follows this order, does not only, not repeat himself in the use of old sermons, but commends himself to the faithful, as "the Scribe instructed unto the Kingdom of Heaven, which bringeth forth out of his treasury things new and old." (St. Matt. xiii. 52).

To complete this discussion, the *formal* question, How to preach, must now be considered. A correct conception of preaching as a Divine Institute and a proper apprehension of the method of pulpit teaching as set forth in the organism of the Church-year, must be complemented by a corresponding conception of the manner of preaching, as regards style and delivery. And for the sake of clearness and convenience we state as our position that the preaching of the Gospel implies and demands

SPEAKING, NOT READING.

The delivery of a sermon now, to a very large extent, is the reading, verbatim, from manuscript or from memory, of a pre-composed oration, the style of which, both as regards language and forms of thought, differs immensely from that easy, direct and personal mode of address, which always characterizes the earnest teacher. The labored composition of the study, logical in its development, faultless in style and elegant in the fullness of its rounded periods, though read with skill, falls upon the ears and hearts of those who frequent our churches with far less effect than does the warm, gushing language of one who *speaks* in earnest and impassioned words which seem to leap from his full heart. Carefully written sermons are, in the great majority of instances, from the very necessity of the case, above the comprehension of not a few of those to whom they are addressed; and, as regards the manner of their delivery,

which is for the most part mechanical and unreal, they fail, even when thoroughly understood, to make the impression, which the same truths differently put, and otherwise delivered, would enstamp upon the minds of those who hear them.

The true conception of preaching is the very simple one, so clearly expressed in the word "teaching," and its characteristics both of style and delivery, should fully correspond with this. To put things clearly, in such simple, transparent language, that all may comprehend, and to utter them with such earnestness and authority, as shall constrain men to hear, are the most obvious qualifications of the successful teacher.

To such an extent, however, has "the itching ear" been humored and cultivated, that the simple, authoritative teaching of the gospel of our Lord, has given place, gradually, to elaborate and prosy presentations of its facts and truths, distorted and discolored oftentimes, by the metaphysical atmosphere through which they are seen by the preacher. There seems, indeed, to be a temptation to not a few ministers in the very habit of writing, the moment they begin to compose, to fall into the rhetorical or metaphysical strain, which adds nothing to the force or value of the truths they discuss, and prevents the making of appropriate impressions by diverting attention to *the manner* of their setting forth. In evidence we need only adduce the remarks which one so frequently hears on coming out of church, as for instance. "*What a beautiful sermon, What a profound discourse, What elegant language,*" as though either æsthetic beauty, or profound thought or fine rhetoric, in their ordinary sense, constituted any part of the business of the ministry of the word. The point upon which we wish to insist with earnest emphasis is, not that these elements may not enter into the composition of sermons, but that in the habit of writing for actual use in the pulpit, the preacher unconsciously glides into such forms of thought and language, as the bent of his mind may determine, and gives them such undue prominence as overshadows the message it is his business to deliver.

On the other hand the minister of the Word, who subordinates everything to the main matter of teaching intelligibly the blessed gospel of Christ, and whose chief business in the study

is to penetrate and apprehend the mysteries of the Christian faith (which have already apprehended him) and all whose preparations are concerned with this as the chief thing, until his whole being is saturated with their presence and power, will have little regard for elegance of style, and no time for philosophical discussions. With mind and heart full to overflowing he will come before his flock, free from the infirmity of human respect, counting it a small thing to be judged of man's judgment—untrammelled and unconfined by the limits of a formal precomposition—in thoughts that breathe and words that burn, he will bring things new and old out of his treasury in such simple, earnest, and manly style, as will hold the attention of all who love the truth as by a magic spell.

It is certainly one of the great and pressing wants of these degenerate times in which we live, that ministers and people should be brought back to the primitive idea, that preaching is not elaborate composition, high wrought rhetoric, rigid logic or metaphysical speculation, but the *simple teaching of the gospel in the way of authoritative statement.* So naturally does this view suggest itself to thinking minds, that, prominent among other reasons, why so many men of culture and refined taste stand aloof from the services of the Church is, that they are repelled by the dry, lifeless and superficial representation of the great facts of the gospel as they are so frequently set forth in the carefully composed essays *about* the Christian mysteries, which are delivered from so many pulpits at the present day. Such persons instinctively perceive, how unfit a thing it is (to use no stronger word), out of mere human respect, or personal vanity or any kindred motive to elaborate away by poetical or philosophical renderings, or in any other way, the plain, simple but sublime facts that make up the history of our Lord's teachings and life. It needs only that the minister of Christ plant himself firmly upon his divine commission, "*as a teacher sent from God,*" and instruct his people earnestly and authoritatively, in the truths of the gospel, and they will very soon learn to look upon and love him as such, and will receive, in childlike simplicity and faith his earnest utterances, little caring for the literary form in which they come.

It is not a little surprising, when the whole case is properly considered, that it ever should have become so common and popular to read sermons as a legitimate mode of pulpit instruction, superior to the old and natural way of speaking directly to the people. The practice of reading is, as compared with speaking properly so called, so inefficient and unfruitful as regards the ends designed to be reached, that, in the affairs of our common life, in popular assembly, and before juries and courts, politicians and lawyers, hardly ever appear with manuscript preparations. They know well, and wisely avail themselves of, the wonderful magnetism there is in the eye of the speaker fixing all other eyes upon his,—the inspiration and power there is in natural tones, as they express the nicest shades of thought and feeling and that general nameless understanding there is between speaker and hearer, when with full self-reliance and manly earnestness he stands before them, fully "en rapport" with their innermost thoughts and feelings. In the use of these most natural helps, they open up a channel of communication, by which their own thoughts, feelings and convictions are carried over into the minds and hearts of those to whom they speak. True indeed is it here, as in other things, that "the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light," who as ministers of the Word of God refuse to avail themselves of these natural helps of eye and voice and action and sympathetic communication, which when sanctified by the grace of Christ, become elements of power in the preaching of the Divine Word.

And while this is so, it must always remain as a reproach to the Gospel and to the shame of the ministry, that the successors of the Apostles, standing in the bosom of a constitution of grace above the secular order, with a divine commission to disciple the nations, must in their teachings of the people be hampered and confined by reading to their congregations carefully written papers on some point in theology or morals, instead of challenging their attention in earnest, manly and apostolic style to the facts and teachings of the gospel, as they bear directly upon the salvation of men and the world, and constitute

the grand centre of all things, "Whether they be things in earth or things in heaven." (Col. i. 20).

In view of what has been said, does it not seem as if men—ministers and people—had to some extent parted with their faith in the divine authority of the preacher's office, and that its functions, as the result of this decay of faith, are performed on the plane and as part of our natural life, inasmuch as the ministry of the Word is subjected to and tried by the rules and standards of a merely human criticism.

There can be no doubt, that the absence of true eloquence, to so lamentable extent, from our modern pulpit, is due, in no small degree to the fact, that the preacher, forgetful of his place and commission in the Apostolic succession, and standing thus on the lower level of humanitarianism, comes before his congregation with that kind of preparation, which leaves no room for the peculiar inspiration which comes upon him, who, with his mind and heart filled with a great thought, looks earnestly down upon his waiting brethren, as they look up lovingly to him for wisdom and strength and consolation. It cannot be otherwise but that the consciousness of a Divine office, the magnitude and importance of which is beyond all comparison—the love of the Master, whose servant and representative he is—and the love of the flock committed to his care, conspire to kindle, and if unhindered, will kindle in the preacher's mind and heart an inspiration of thought and word, which will light up also the sacred fires of devotion in the hearts of his brethren, as he and they stand together in the communion of that glorious supernatural world created by our Lord. And thus the preaching of the word, which is truly a sacramental power, is not a dry, lifeless discussion of doctrine, but a vivid reproduction and *re*-presentation of the facts and mysteries of our Holy Religion.

The last point to which we would call attention in this connection, is, that read sermons as compared with preaching, properly so called, almost always lack personality and point. The ear, indeed, instinctively recognizes the difference between *reading*, no matter how well it is done, and language spoken directly to the people. There are few public speakers who have

not noticed the very apparent change which manifests itself all over an audience, when the reading of what has been laboriously written, gives way to the earnest words of extemporaneous address, as they come gushing and warm from a full heart, clothing forms of thought, that go right home to the "business and bosoms of men."

The power of the gospel (humanly speaking) to attract from the world lies, to a large extent, in its being allowed to address itself to each man's consciousness, in the way of direct personal challenge, and for such, particularly, as have no interest in the worship of the sanctuary, it is matter of prime importance, that the gospel should be preached in such personal and pointed style, as to demand and claim their attention to its message as addressed directly to them. It need scarcely be said here, how difficult, how almost impossible a thing it is, in the atmosphere of the study, in the use of the pen, to compose those forms of plain, personal address, which are so powerful to bring men within the periphery or outer court (as it were) of heavenly influences.

There has been much discussion, of late, in regard to the causes which have combined, particularly in the larger towns and cities, to keep such large masses of people away from the churches. Among the many reasons alleged as sufficient in whole or part to account for this deplorable state of things, we do not remember to have seen or heard it suggested anywhere, that it might in large measure be traced directly to the degeneracy of the modern pulpit in the very particular of which we speak. The sermons which are now so generally read *at* the people, instead of being addressed authoritatively and pointedly to them are destitute of the elements of popular attraction, and have no personal interest for the unthinking masses. The want of true earnestness (not of declamation, of which there is more than enough) gives to these pulpit performances, a painful sense of what may be called, a *grand unreality*, which multitudes feel and are influenced by, while they may yet be able to give it no expression in words.

Let our Protestant pastors, in whose ministrations the sermon forms so central a part, only show themselves to be enthusiastically in earnest, as those of so noble a vocation should be, in their preaching of the Word; not supremely careful in regard to diction or ambitious of literary reputation, speaking in simple, transparent language of the things they "have seen and heard," and it will not be long until the hundreds and thousands who visit their churches *occasionally* only to hear, will, by and by, remain *habitually* to pray.

This whole subject ought to commend itself to the solemn and earnest consideration of the pastors and brethren of our common Protestant Christianity. With us, preaching holds, relatively, a much higher place and wields a wider influence than in the communion of the Church of Rome. To such an extreme, indeed, has this prominence, which we give to preaching, been carried, that in many quarters the sermon absorbs, or rather *is* almost the entire service, hymn and prayer being only employed as preliminary and supplementary to the office of the pulpit. Such being the fact, there is special reason and necessity also, that the ministry of the word should, as nearly as possible, realize the true idea of this Divine Institute, as a sacramental challenge from the invisible world, and for this purpose:—

1. Ministers and people should alike cultivate faith in the prophetical office of the ministry, as one of Divine appointment and commission, through which the Master Himself continues to teach. It is especially the duty of the pastor to instruct his people in regard to the true nature of this apostolic function, and to magnify this great office by sinking his own little individuality out of sight in the greatness of the office itself, never by implication even, allowing it to stand on humanitarian ground, but holding it always in living conjunction with that supernatural order of grace in which Christ now lives and works. Is it not written, "He that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and Him that sent me?"

2. It is involved in this magnifying of the office, that its

teaching shall be ordered after the most efficient method as regards the exhibition of the truth. Christ must be all in all, that those who hear may come to Him, whom to know aright is life eternal. Determined, as St. Paul said of himself, to know nothing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified, the shepherd to be faithful and efficient in his office, must lead the sheep of his flock, to follow the Master "in the regeneration," on to the Heavenly country whither He has gone, and the way there, is over the road our Lord has traveled. Bethlehem, Nazareth, Gethsemane, Calvary, Gennesaret and Olivet all lie in the path of our pilgrimage, and must each in turn be visited again and again until we are filled with their spirit and comprehend something of their grandeur and glory. They constitute —these mighty mysteries—a glorious organic unity, and may be rightly approached and truly known only when contemplated in their proper historical order and connections. It should be the object then of "the Steward of the Mysteries of God," to preach the Gospel not in disjointed fragments, but in its organic unity—to preach not *about* Christ, but *Christ Himself* in the glory of His Person and the greatness of His work; for thus more successfully than in any other way, by successive and organically connected lessons, (which like the multiplied blows of the sculptor's chisel, the value and force of which may not at the time be seen,) will the image of our Lord formed in us by faith, be brought out clearly and beautifully in our lives.

3. This Divine Institute demands that those who are clothed with its authority should, in the proper sense of the word, *preach* the Gospel in such earnest and manly style, as is hardly possible in the case of those who habitually read. It is sometimes urged as an argument in favor of written and read sermons, that a minister, following the other method upon which we insist as the true method, will fall into a loose and desultory style and will, in the end, land in a constant and threadbare repetition of himself. But to preach as we have set forth, requires intense study and prayerful consecration to the work of teaching the Gospel, as the sole business of the preacher's life; and he who in the study lives face to face with the Christian mysteries,

bathed by these habitual communings "in the new light of the Incarnate Word," can never be either a dull, prosy preacher, a mechanical repeater of himself or a mere retailer of other men's thoughts. To give vigor and force to the ministrations of the pulpit, it is, of all else, most imperatively demanded, that the minister be himself thoroughly *in*structed, (not in the way of mere intellections, but by faith)—saturated as we have said with the truth, so as always to carry with him a present sense of the realness of that supernatural world from whose bosom he speaks. A celebrated tragedian, being asked by a minister of the Gospel, how it happened that actors always delivered their parts upon the stage with so much greater effect than clergymen did their sermons, replied, "You speak truth as though it were fiction, we speak fiction as though it were truth." Only let pastors bring themselves up to the true apostolic idea of their office, and in their studies and preachings *follow the Master*, as also His example, delivering their messages from full hearts in simple, earnest, unstudied words, and not only will a great reproach be removed from the ministry of the Word, but the preaching of the Gospel will show itself to be eminently "*the power of God unto salvation.*"

Art. VIII. THE UNITY OF THE APOSTLES' CREED.

BY J. W. NEVIN, D.D., LANCASTER, PA.

What has been said of the origin and structure of the Apostles' Creed, in our article in the January number, has already brought into view, in some measure, its organic unity and its fundamental authority for the Christian world. It is not by chance, or through the arbitrary outward ordering of men in any way, as we have seen, that either the matter or the form of the symbol established themselves in the beginning, or that, having so established themselves, they have found acknowledgment as the one only sure basis of Christian belief in the universal Church through all ages. The Creed could not have carried with it historically this universal force, for the Oriental, Roman Catholic, and Protestant worlds, if it were not in its own nature, and in its own essential constitution, of true ecumenical and fundamental character for Christianity itself; in such sort, and to such extent, that no scheme of Christian truth or doctrine can be regarded as valid for faith at all, which has not started originally from this form of sound words, and which does not continue rooted and grounded in it to the last.

The unity of the Creed, we say, is organic. It is so, both as to its matter and as to its form. The different articles of which it consists grow forth from a single principle; and the force of this principle reaches into all its articles, determining their existence, and imparting to them severally all their significance and truth. Each article is what it is as an object of faith, only through its relation to the general root out of which all grow; while the root also is what it is as an object of faith, only through its relation in like manner to what thus proceeds from it in the way of necessary derivation and growth. Such is the oneness of the Creed in its matter; its articles together make up a single whole. This oneness of matter, however, involves at the same

time necessarily oneness of form also. Viewed as an organic whole, in other words, the articles, or parts of which the symbol is composed, are not only derived from a common principle or root, but they are so derived from this that their relation to it serves to fix and determine, at the same time, their relation also to one another; so that as objects of faith, they can be apprehended truly only in the order in which they are here made to challenge faith, and in no other order. This does not mean, of course, that each article must always be distinctly expressed, to give us a valid Christian confession. We have seen already that there was what may be called a historical development of the articles of the Creed in part, in the beginning; and it is quite possible still to make a good confession, that shall not go beyond the acknowledgment of the Holy Trinity, as we are bound to it in our baptism, or that shall be no more even than St. Peter's memorable act of faith, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.* But the Creed in any such abbreviated form is always potentially the Creed in its full form—the presence from the first implicitly of all that this is found to comprise at the last explicitly; and what we mean to say now is, that, when it comes to such explication and full utterance, all the articles of the Creed have not only their existence, but their position and place also, necessarily determined by the constitution of the symbol itself. They necessitate and condition one another in the order in which they are here actually put together, and allow no other order.

This necessary organization of the Creed, we have already seen, proceeds from its corrrespondence with the actual movement of the Christian salvation, as it takes its rise in the mystery of the Incarnation, and runs its course onward to the life everlasting. It is the simple response of faith to what is thus comprehended objectively in the coming of Christ in the flesh—the true historical gospel ("good tidings of great joy") carried out to its last consequences and results. Only as answering in this way to the actual order of the gospel, may we conceive of faith here as being faith at all, and not simply fancy or speculation. The Creed is, by its very conception, the primitive and

deepest (and therefore most necessary and universal) consciousness of the Christian Church, moving in full harmony with the fundamental movement of Christianity itself. As such it is of force for all ages. It can never be superseded by any other form of supposed sound words. There can be no getting back of it, or aside of it, to the apprehension of what Christianity is, in any different way. No scheme of Christian belief, no construction of Christian doctrine, can deserve to be considered sound or safe, which does not grow forth organically from the radical organization of Christianity as we have it in the Apostles' Creed.

They labor under a grand mistake, then, who imagine that it can ever be possible to form a better basis or platform of faith for the Christian world, than that which is comprised in this ancient symbol. There is, we know, a large amount of religious thinking at the present time, in this country particularly, which is of a different mind. Much of what claims to be the best form of Protestantism among us—Protestantism in its most enlightened and most evangelical character—considers itself to have out-grown entirely the leading-strings of the Creed, and to be more than equal to the task of providing in short order, at any time, a decidedly better scheme of fundamental Christian doctrine. In the view of this Puritanic school, the Apostles' Creed is entitled to a certain sort of traditional respect, on account of the honor with which it has been regarded in past ages; but it belongs properly to those past ages, we are told, and not to our age; it is now ecclesiastically dead, if not absolutely buried, and any attempt to set it up again as a living rule of faith can deserve only to be looked upon with pity and contempt. Such modern religionists can see nothing particularly worthy of admiration in the Creed, but much rather to be dissatisfied with. What of fundamental truth there is in it, they are ready to tell us, might be expressed in better terms; some of its articles are unscriptural, and involve actual error; material points of faith are not found in it at all; so that altogether, taken in its own original sense and without any sort of mental qualification, it seems to them to be anything but

such a summary of the first truths of religion as the best interests of religion demand. They feel it to be at once crude in its matter and poor in its form, and look upon it as being a witness and proof of the spiritual weakness of the period to which it owes its birth, far more than an argument of its spiritual strength.

The fundamental articles of Christianity, for those who think in this way, group themselves always into a form very different from the Creed, which is felt by them at the same time to be far more logically methodical and complete. Where the scheme claims to be evangelical, in the technical sense of the term, it will be found to run, for example, in some such order as the following. Beginning with the existence and the leading attributes of God, we shall have in the next place the mystery of the Holy Trinity; then the inspiration and divine authority of the Bible (or it may be the Bible first, as the principle of all revealed religion, and then the Trinity); next the fact of the fall, and the state of sin and misery to which it has reduced our ruined race; then, possibly, the decree of election, underlying the whole plan of redemption as in the Westminster Catechism (or with a more liberal construction this can be left out); next the incarnation and the union of the two natures in Christ's Person; then the atonement, wrought by His death upon the cross, and followed by His resurrection from the dead; then the necessity of repentance and faith; then the doctrines of regeneration, justification and sanctification; all ending, finally, with the resurrection of the dead, the general judgment at the end of the world, the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and the going away of the wicked into everlasting damnation. Of the sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper, mention may be made possibly somewhere in the system; but not in a way to make them of essential account in the constitution of the Christian salvation; while the article of the Church, in all probability, will be allowed to pass without any notice whatever.

Conventional platforms of faith, more or less in this form, have become common in modern times. Congregational Churches in particular, of the Puritanic way of thinking, are ac-

customed to form in some such style for themselves doctrinal "covenants," as they are called, to which all are required to assent and agree, who join themselves to their communion; this being especially what is to be considered their profession of the Christian faith. And there is not a single one of these societies probably, which is not fully persuaded that it has in its own particular platform, thus constructed, a far more exhaustive and efficient summary of the first truths of Christianity, and a far more sure and firm basis of theological orthodoxy, than any that has ever been supposed to be comprised in the Apostles' Creed. No one of them would be willing at all to substitute the Creed for its church covenant. To do so, would be felt to involve some want of sympathy with the full and proper sense of the Gospel, and could only be regarded in this view as a falling away from a higher to a lower faith. It must seem at once both lax and unevangelical.

But let no one be deceived by any pretensions of this sort. We may have platforms of Christian doctrine different from the Creed, which for certain purposes are important and worthy of respect; but we never can have any, we repeat, that may deserve to come in the room of the Creed, or that may be entitled to confidence as original compends of Gospel truth on the outside of the Creed. The best of these modern platforms is but a synopsis of what are taken to be the chief articles of the Christian religion, considered in the way of outward reflection; it is the work of the understanding, rather than the direct product of faith; and as such never can be made to stand for the Creed, without derangement and damage to the whole idea of Christianity.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Christ in Song. Hymns of Immanuel: Selected from all ages, with notes, by Philip Schaff, D. D. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co., 1869, pp. 711.

We are indebted to both publisher and editor for this collection of Christian poetry, calculated by the beauty of its appearance and the precious character of its contents to be hailed by every lover of sacred poetry, as a most valuable contribution to the literature of the day. It embraces, to use the words of the editor, "the choicest hymns on the Person and Work of our Lord from all ages, denominations, and tongues," furnished in elegant, legible type, on exquisitely-beautiful paper, and adorned wherever good taste would permit with appropriate Christian symbols. The Christian poems, from the day of Clemens Alexandrinus down to the present time, which have found a home in the Church, because of their pious fervor and true poetic fire, are here collected and offered to the student of sacred poetry in a most attractive garb. The Greek, Latin, German, Spanish, Dutch, and Danish Hymnists have been brought within the reach of the English reader, and the classic hymns of his own language are mingled with them in one poetic bouquet, whose sweet fragrance will delight the heart of the believer when the secular poetry of the day shall become tiresome and insipid.

The collection is divided into two parts—the first containing mostly those poems that set forth the objective facts in Christ's life, and is entitled "*Christ for us*," and the second, the post-reformation poems, which "bring out more fully the subjective application of Christ's merits, and our relation to Him," receiving the title of "*Christ in us*." In the first part they are arranged under the following divisions: The Advent, The Infant Saviour with the Virgin Mother, The Epiphany, Christ's Life and Example, The Passion, The Burial of Christ, The Resurrection, The Ascension, Christ in Glory, and Christ judging the World. In the second part are found the following divisions: The Love and Loveliness of Christ, Christ our Refuge and Strength, Christ our Peace, Faith in Christ, Union with Christ, The Holy Communion, Love and Gratitude to Christ, For Ever with Christ, and Praise and Adoration of Christ.

The names of the authors are given wherever known, the time of composition, and, when translated from another language, the name of the English translator. Our own Church, both in Germany and in this country, is represented by some of its sweetest poets.

We feel that a great debt of thankfulness is due to the Editor for this valuable contribution to the Hymnological literature of the

day. The different Denominations are beginning to tire of the trash which now lumbers up their Hymn Books, and are making arrangements to prepare new selections which shall contain only those Hymns that are inspired by genuine Christian spirit and true poetic fire. Dr. Schaff's collection will be a great aid to this work. Indeed, it will be indispensable to all persons engaged in efforts to supply the people with words that shall be worthy of a place in the public worship of the Saviour. Of course, it is more than a Hymn Book. There is much in it altogether unsuited for such a purpose. But its very encyclopædic character will make it a fitting companion in our private devotions, as well as the source from which will be drawn materials absolutely necessary to every modern Hymn Book. We hope that it will find a wide circulation among all who love to commune with the pious utterances of Christian genius. L. H. S.

THE LAW OF LOVE AND LOVE AS A LAW; or Moral Science, Theoretical and Practical. By Mark Hopkins, D. D., LL.D., President of Williams College, New York: Charles Scribner and Company, 1869.

We have examined this work on *Moral Philosophy* with some interest, coming as it does, just after the work of Prof. Porter on The Human Intellect. We are glad to see the leading minds in our American Colleges thus turned with some degree of earnestness to the department of Philosophy, which for the most part hitherto has received comparatively little attention in this country. It may be taken as an omen, also, that the pressure in favor of what is called the practical, or utilitarian view of education, has not been able to rule out earnest investigations in a department which many shallow brains regard as unnecessary and vain.

The aphoristic title of the book, however, seems to indicate that the learned author has hardly travelled to the depths of his subject. It is not often that a science or a system can find a sufficient statement of its principle in such an aphorism. Accordingly we find in looking into this work, that it comes far short of that philosophic depth, which characterizes German works in this department, as for instance *Rothe's Ethics*, or the system of Ethics which has been taught for years in Marshall, and Franklin Marshall College.

He fails in the outstart to give a clear idea of the sphere of *the moral*, as distinguished from the *natural*, and this leads to unnecessary trouble in continually making distinctions between natural law and moral law. His definitions of *law* also are prolix and defective. For instance: "For this class of laws, the laws of things, the conditional ideas will be, (1) Being. (2) Force. (3) Uniformity. (4) An End. Physical law will then be product of being putting forth force uniformly. So far all will agree. I would add, for an end." Again: "For this form of law" (moral law) "the prerequisite ideas will be, (1) Being, conscious and rational. (2) Force, under

the control of such a being. This will include free-will. (3) An end which can possibly be known as such only as there is in it a good; and (4) Obligation. We may then have not only law, but moral law."

It seems to us it is necessary first to get an idea of *law* in its generality, before much progress can be made in explaining the nature of *laws*, whether physical or moral.

This, however, the author does not do. His system, indeed, is a treatment of the subject on the subjective side only. It is morality *in* man of which he treats. He says that "Men have sometimes spoken of the various faculties and powers involved in the moral nature, such as conscience and free will, as lying at the ground of obligation; sometimes they have spoken of that ultimate ground or reason in view of which alone the moral nature can legitimately act, and sometimes they have included both." This, he tells us, has introduced confusion into the perplexed speculations on the subject of morals. And then adds; "But this confusion will not surprise us if we observe how the speculations on these different subjects imply and almost necessarily run into each other." We should rather think they *do* run into each other, not only *almost*, but *altogether*, necessarily. They are related as truth and thinking. We find the same objection here that we made to Prof. Porter's work on the Human Intellect. Under that title he undertook to treat the whole problem of philosophy. So now Dr. Hopkins starts from man's moral nature, and seeks to find all the elements and principles of the moral problem there. Morality is based on an objective system of moral law, as real as the objective system of truth in which the intellect is active, or that of the physical universe in which material things exist. Law, moral law, is law out of us as well as in us. *What is moral law?* we should consider one of the first questions in Ethics. When that is answered, the way is opened to consider its presence and meaning in our moral nature. Further on the author says, "Thus do we find law,—Moral Law. Moral Law is the affirmation by the Moral Reason of obligation on the part of every man to choose that as his supreme end which God designed him for, &c." Rather the affirmation is made because of the nature of the law in relation to us. This serves to show, however, that it is throughout, the moral nature of man that he is considering.

The only place, we remember now, that he touches at all on the great problem of moral freedom, surely deserving a full chapter in a system of Ethics, is where he makes it a condition of obligation. Here again his definition is very weak and defective, or rather his idea is incorrect. "It is this power of choice that belongs, as an elementary constituent, to a rational soul, and it is in this that the deepest freedom consists—a freedom which can be taken away only by destroying the soul itself." Evidently he uses the word freedom here as synonymous with the power of choice.

Freedom can be lost and man become a slave without the destruction of the soul.

The second part of the work treats of duties. The third section of it treats of our duties to God. These are, 1. The cultivation of a devotional spirit. 2. Prayer. 3. The duty of keeping the Sabbath.

A rather weak ending for a work on Moral Philosophy.

We take pleasure in adding, however, that the book is Christian in its tone, if not the most scientific. He repudiates the system of utilitarianism and other false systems with ability and decision. We do not know what the author will think of the favor with which the *Catholic World* speaks of his work (which in the same number gives a scathing criticism of Prof. Porter's work on The Human Intellect, by, as we suppose, Dr. Brownson). It says, "He establishes also the freedom of the will as a necessary condition of obligation, and thus cuts up Calvinism root and branch."

For its noble and elevated views of Christian Morality, we commend the work, as calculated to exert a wholesome influence wherever it is studied.

Lectures on the First and Second Epistles of Peter. By the Rev. John Lillie, D.D., with an Introduction by Philip Schaff, D.D., New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway, 1869.

This is a posthumous work of an esteemed pastor, who, in addition to his pastoral labors, found time to produce valuable contributions to the study of the Sacred Scriptures. He prepared elaborate critical and philological commentaries on the Epistles to the Thessalonians, the Epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude, besides a translation of Auberlen and Riggenbach's Commentary on the Thessalonians, with valuable additions, for the American edition of Lange's "Bible Work."

Among the numerous Commentaries that are being so rapidly issued from the press, this of Dr. Lillie is well deserving a place. Its chief value consists in the form in which it is given, viz: in a series of lectures, which furnish a model for the use of pastors. The habit of preaching and lecturing on single texts, which prevails so generally in our day, fails to bring the Scriptures before the people as a whole and in their connections. Every pastor feels the need of giving his people instruction in a whole Epistle, for instance, and yet finds it difficult to do this in a popular style, that will unite instruction and application. We believe that the use of the Scripture lessons for the Church Year in preaching has a decided preference over textual preaching, and yet this latter has its advantages too. A critical and faithful explanation of the Sacred Text must go along with the discussion and presentation of general themes gathered from the Scriptures. In this view this work of Dr. Lillie will be useful to pastors, as well as profitable for general reading.

We cannot agree with his explanations of certain passages in the Epistles of Peter, nor with the view of predestination which he finds in the address of the first Epistle. On the Church and the Sacraments, wherever they are referred to, he follows the Calvinistic theory of the recent times rather than that of original Calvinism. But this is to be expected. Dr. Schaff, who commends the work, pays a tender and beautiful tribute to the deceased in the introduction.

Cyclopœdia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by the Rev. John McClintock, D.D., and James Strong, S. T. D. Vol. II. C, D, New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square, 1868.

A favorable notice of the 1st volume of this work appeared in the October number of this Review for 1867, written by Dr. Harbaugh. In the present volume, we notice his initials in the index to three articles, which we have read with a sad interest. We notice a number of articles, by reference to the index, with the well known initials P. S. These are links which connect this truly great work with the German Reformed Church.

It seems hardly necessary to speak of the importance of such a work as this. In it are gathered, by the united labor of eminent scholars, whatever of importance is known on all subjects connected with the Bible, the Church, and Religion. An immense amount of valuable information is thus brought within the reach of many, who would otherwise not have access to it.

So far as we have been able to examine the articles, we find them able and satisfactory. They seem to possess the happy mean between too great length and too great brevity. In regard to the style in which the work is published, the name of the publishers is a sufficient guarantee that it is of the very best character. An interesting feature of this Cyclopœdia is the handsome manner in which it is illustrated.

The second volume covers the letters C and D, and contains 933 double column pages. The remaining volumes, most of the articles for which are already prepared, will appear as rapidly as they can be carried through the press. There are Encyclopœdias in the German language, as *Herzog's*, which are more elaborate than this, but we have none in the English language in this country, covering the same field which is at all equal to it. We presume the price continues the same as for the first volume—cloth, $5 per volume, sheep, $6, half morocco, $8.

Since writing the above, we have received a copy of the *first volume* of this work, and an examination of it has confirmed us in the favorable opinion we have already expressed. For those who have not access to any German work of the kind, it will prove an accession to the library which must be of great value. We are impressed with the wisdom displayed by the editors in making it

neither too long nor too brief. Even those who are supplied with works treating of the subjects that are embraced in these volumes, will find it a great convenience for reference; and those who may desire to pursue these subjects still further will find ample direction in the works and authors here given.

The style in which it is published is the very best. We have no doubt it will find a ready and wide sale.

An Introduction to the Study of English Literature. By Henry N. Day, New York: Charles Scribner and Company, 1869.

An excellent work, prepared on the right principle. One excellent feature of the book is, that the author gives specimens, or selections from the English classics, with notes and vocabularies. It is not necessary that a student should read the whole work of an English author in order to become fully acquainted with his style. A good selection is all that is required. One who reads and understands the *Clerk's Tale*, for instance, will be able to form a correct idea of the whole of the *Canterbury Tales* of Chaucer. The same is true of *Spencer*.

The only objection that we would make to the volume is, that it does not contain more full information as to the history of English literature. But this perhaps would overburden the volume for the use for which it is intended.

We sympathize with the movement, which is becoming general in our Colleges, to make the English language and literature a subject of regular study. Why should not Chaucer and Spencer, Shakespeare and Milton be studied as well as Virgil and Homer and Plato? Instead of detracting from the interest in the Latin and Greek classics, we believe it would add to that interest.

We believe also that an outline course in English literature ought to be commenced early, say in the Freshman year, so that students may have some guide as to the little reading they can attend to while at College. Pushing this matter off until the Senior year leaves but little time for forming any acquaintance with authors and their works. As a work adapted to those who are beginning their study of English literature, we commend this volume to all whom it may concern.

Petros, the Wonderful Building. A Sermon preached to the Convention of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in Pittsburg, Pa., Nov. 12th, 1868. By Jos. A. Seiss, D. D.

Considerable importance attaches to this sermon, from the fact of its having been preached before the last General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. It may be taken as the expression of that venerable body, on a subject of vital importance, viz., the position of Peter in the Apostolic College, and the relation of the creed to the Church of all ages. The theory that Christ turned

from Peter, and pointed to Himself, when He said, "Upon this rock I will build my Church," is simply absurd, because it does violence to the figure employed, in that it makes Christ at the same time the architect and the foundation. Dr. Seiss very candidly and fairly concedes to Peter a primacy among the twelve, a position supported by many passages of Scripture which he points out; and he very properly argues that this primacy is not one of jurisdiction. The points to sustain this view are very generally overlooked or ignored by Protestants, for fear of conceding too much to the claims of the Roman Church. But this is not an honest method of interpreting the Scriptures. Here are the points as given by Dr. Seiss.

1. Matthew specifically pronounces him (Peter) "the first," (x. 2.) 2. Four lists of the Apostles are given in the Scriptures, and his name occurs first in each of them. (Matt. x. 2, 4; Mark iii. 16, 19; Luke vi. 14, 16; Acts i. 13.) 3. He everywhere appears foremost in the Apostolic band. 4. The gifts and qualities of Peter as a man, to constitute him a leader among the twelve. 5. His age, &c., &c.

Dr. Seiss strikes the right chord also when he says, "Peter confessed Christ, and it was that confession of his, living in his soul, and speaking from his lips that constituted *him* a Christian Petros, and in virtue of which Christ pronounced *him* the *Petra* on which His Church was to be built." Not upon the creed, abstractly considered, as some maintain, but upon Peter as confessing Christ in the creed, is the church built.

We could have wished that Dr. Seiss had discussed more fully the relation of *the creed* (for there is one which has obtained this character pre-eminently) to confessions generally. Especially in our day, when Protestantism presents so many confessions, is this called for.

But we commend the sermon as worthy of the occasion on which it was preached, and truly edifying to all who feel interested in the subject of which it treats. It is to be had at the Lutheran Book Store, 807 Vine street, Philadelphia.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1869.

Art. I.—THE WRITTEN AND THE INCARNATE WORD.

BY REV. P. S. DAVIS, A. M., CHAMBERSBURG, PA.

It may startle the Bibliolaters of the present day, to see it asserted that the written word of God, without the *Incarnate Word* is an unfulfilled promise. Any such statement may be regarded by many thoughtless persons as a blasphemous attack upon the Bible, and even upon the character of Him who has so mercifully given it to us. We protest against this, however; claiming most confidently that the only view that puts honor on the Scriptures and vindicates the Almighty is that which apprehends all that He has written as yea and Amen *in Christ Jesus*. (2 Cor. i. 20).

We believe that there are thousands of well meaning men, who fail to apprehend this fact. This is wonderfully illustrated in the reports and addresses we hear when we assemble in our laudable zeal for the dissemination of the Scriptures. We have often felt very painfully that if some intelligent pagan like Socrates, Plato, or Cicero, were to come into some of these meetings and judge simply from what he might hear, he would conclude that the "orator" employed, was urging men to stake their salvation upon a book or theory contained in it, rather than in a personal Redeemer. An old Roman would doubtless be impressed with the fact that here were some Sybilline leaves

which no proud Tarquin could refuse to buy, without great peril to himself and the world; but of the fact that God became man for us men and our salvation, he might be left in complete ignorance. In a sermon expressly prepared for such an occasion, a few years ago, the name of Christ was only mentioned once, and then by way of rhetorical flourish, in connection with the United States flag; and in a lately published report of a Bible Society the Saviour is scarcely alluded to, except in a perverted passage of the Scriptures, to which we may refer more particularly in the course of this article.

If it be said in answer to all this, that it is superfluous to say anything about Christ on these occasions, as His Being and work are pre-supposed, we reply that while this may hold good, as far as business statements are concerned, it will not excuse those parts of the reports, sermons and addresses in which the reasons for circulating the Scriptures are so elaborately set forth. We have before us one of these addresses, which we thought worthy of being substantially bound a good while ago, and to which we often refer as a type of many we have heard since. In it, young men are exhorted to study and circulate the Scriptures on account of their "literary merits." And then we have a flaming panegyric upon the poetry, and marvelously narrated incidents of the Bible, supported by the testimony of such men as John Milton, Sir Matthew Hale, and Sir William Jones. This is all well enough, if God's Holy Word needs to be upheld by human opinions, but it always seems to us like complimenting that which is Divine.* Now we know well enough that the Holy Scriptures are the best literature in the world, that they are as high above any human composition as God is above man, but we do not circulate them because of their literary merits. That would not constitute a sufficient reason for sending them to the heathen, and indeed, the mass of mankind even in Christian lands cannot be expected to have any literary tastes. In fact it is not a primary design of the Bible to cultivate or answer the demands of literary taste, the fancy literature of the modern pulpit to the

* Unfortunately our author cites Rousseau as saying things equally complimentary, and we can hardly help asking "Cui Bono?"

contrary notwithstanding. What pastor in his visitations among the afflicted, would read a chapter from the book of Job, merely as part of a splendid epic? Who would read one of our Saviour's sublime parables simply to point out its beauty of conception and expression? It would be sad indeed, if we were obliged to say to any poor ignorant penitent, "Here is a touching *description* of the crucifixion, but a man must be a *belle lettres* scholar to come to a proper appreciation of it." It would afford but little comfort to a dying man, however great a biblical scholar, or admirer of beautiful things said in the Scriptures he might be, if after all its poetry and philosophy there were no real Personal Redeemer who not only spake as never man spake, but was able to save even unto the uttermost.

And yet here we have a discourse in which the Bible is set for the salvation of the world, at best, as a beautiful system of ethics or morals, through about the same process to all appearance, in which the writings of Plato and Seneca, permeated the minds, and influenced the lives of the old Greeks and Romans. The name of Christ is mentioned but twice;—once in a text quoted in an anecdote, told about Flavel's preaching, and once in a parenthetical clause which is followed by a quotation from Lord Byron, by way of climax.

As "scholars," "patriots," and "accountable beings," we are plainly told "*the Bible*," (not Christ) "*is our only safety.*" The Scriptures are every where put in the place of Christ instead of leading to Him.

Against all of this we most solemnly protest, alleging confidently, that this is not honoring the written word of God, but wrenching it from its true position as testifying of Him, to whom the hopes of man are linked. And we make this assertion all the more confidently, because the Bible itself, as well as the facts in the case, will bear us out in it.

If the Scripture, all of which is profitable, is able to make any Timothy wise unto salvation, it is "through faith which is in *Christ Jesus.*" (2 Tim. iii. 15). "This is life eternal," says our Divine Redeemer; not that they may be Biblical scholars, or know theological science, but "that they may know *Thee*, the

only true God, and *Jesus Christ* whom Thou hast sent." (John xvii. 3). The highest revelation then, that God has made to man, and the only revelation that is life-giving is not through His written word, but through the "Word made flesh." He was that *Word* of life (*Λόγον ζωῆς επέχοντες*,) that the Philippians were to hold forth.

The Mosaic account of the creation written of course long after the events recorded had taken place, was not intended to be a treatise on astronomy or a system of geology through which men are to grope their way by *a posteriori* arguments back to God. Man could not by thus searching find out the Almighty, and if he could, his inductive reasoning might lead him to inquiries beyond the existence of God. Instead of being discovered *by* man He revealed Himself *to* man as *The Absolute*. When He did thus reveal Himself, it was not simply to declare what He would *say* to him in the way of instruction, but what He had *done* in the way of creation and what He would *do* in the way of redemption. It was not simply to declare what He *was from all eternity*, but what He would *become in time*, in order to save man from his lost estate. Satan had ruined man and made his whole heritage subject to vanity. With the whole constitution of his being and of the world thus impaired by sin, no mere enlightenment of his mind, even from above, and no divine psalmody put in his mouth, could stay the process of disintegration and death. The evil one was master of the situation, possessing the inmost citadel of man's being, and until a stronger one would come, he would hold his goods in peace, whatever might be *said to* us or *of* us. To deliver man from this estate, required not simply a spoken or a written word, but a Personal Redeemer and a real *work*.

It was not sufficient then that God should reveal Himself to man, merely *as* God, giving him written statutes and encouraging him with promises. He must be "manifested in the flesh" in order to impart a new life to our humanity, and *accomplish* our salvation in a most actual way by redemptive *acts*. Only in this way could the awful law of sin and death which is working in us be met and overcome. Accordingly the first an-

nouncement of God to fallen man is not, "I will *speak* to you from the cloud; I will give you a sublime system of morals, and cause my words of warning and promise to be written and even printed and distributed centuries after this; but "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head."

To this great event everything now looked. The law was given as a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ. Of Him did all the prophets speak. The Shekinah shining between the cherubim was but a type of that more perfect tabernacle by which He was to come. The high-priest with the sprinkled blood and entrance within the veil was to show men that these sacrifices could never make the comers thereto perfect, and point to the Great High-priest of our profession, who was to offer Himself once for all, and then pass into the heavens to intercede for us. Meanwhile the paschal supper, the deliverance from Egypt, the feeding with manna—all looked forward to the mysteries of grace in that promised seed. Indeed we cannot say that this or that prophecy or event is Messianic, and that others are not, for every word, and every thing, down to Gabriel's announcement to the Virgin Mother (Luke i. 28), was not simply an evidence of but a preparation *for* the coming of the Christ of God. The whole history of Judaism and of the world was but a voice in the wilderness saying, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His paths straight."

Then, "when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." In His own person God and man were brought to a real atonement. He fulfilled all righteousness, and by the power brought into the service of our humanity, redeemed it in the most actual way from sin and death. He is now the one in whom our hopes are centred, and of course the proper object of our faith. Without a knowledge of Him, we repeat, we can have no life, (John xvii. 3), and all mere biblical learning, which so many think has its end in itself, cannot help us.

This assertion is sustained by the rebuke which the Saviour gave the Jews on this very subject. "Ye search the Scrip-

tures," said He, "for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of *me*." (John v. 39). We know that the verb "search" (ερευνᾶτε) is here rendered in our received English version in the imperative mood as if it enjoined a command; and that the whole passage in the mouth of many a man is made to teach: That we must search the Scriptures, *because* in them we have eternal life. It may not be superfluous on this account to say that while we may be commanded in other places to study God's word, *this* passage teaches no such thing; that ερευνᾶτε is in the indicative mood, and that the Saviour here charges the Jews with making a ruinous use of the Scriptures, by supposing them to terminate on themselves as life-giving, rather than designed to testify of Him.

The Jews did search the Scriptures, as the Saviour here declares; they *searched* them, as the word expresses it, as the lioness deprived of her whelps scours the plain and traces the footsteps of man. At the time of our Saviour they had not the New Testament, as we know, but they made vast account of the study of the old. The Talmud represents God as saying to David, "I am better pleased with one day in which thou sittest and studiest the law than I shall be with a thousand sacrifices which thy son Solomon shall offer upon mine altar."* How fully the study of the law and the prophets entered into their minds in the days of our Saviour, no one who reads the gospels need be told. They were ever trying to measure Him by tests derived from that source.

For their study of the Scriptures they had various motives, just as men have now. One was to become *wise* in them. They wished to be like Solomon, who had said, "The wise man will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients, * * * he will keep sayings of the renowned men, and enter withal into the subtleties of parables. He will search out the hidden meaning of proverbs, and will be conversant in the secrets of parables." This all showed itself in the sayings which the Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, Doctors, Priests and Scribes brought

* Tract Shabbath, fol. 30.

against the Son of God, and which He turned against them, vanquishing them on their own field and with their own weapons, and declaring, "Behold a greater than Solomon is here." Besides this they thought they might gain eternal life by the study of the word of God. One of their Talmudic sayings was, "He who studies daily in the law is worthy to have a portion in the world to come."* When the coming of the Messiah was more immediately expected their researches were greatly stimulated; but they thought that when He would come, eternal life would accrue to them, not as flowing from His Divine human Person, but as a reward of their knowledge of, as well as their obedience to the law. "In *them*," says the Saviour, "ye think† ye have eternal life."‡ And yet all of their searching of their Scriptures, and all the veneration they had for every jot and tittle that had been written, was of no avail, because they ignored Him of whom all was to testify. "They are they which testify of *me*," says the Saviour, "and ye will not come unto me that ye may have eternal life."

The mere Scriptures, then, are not sufficient in themselves to give us eternal life. Indeed, God never intended to make our salvation dependent upon a written word, but upon a life-giving Seed, and unless that Seed had come and bruised the serpent's head, all prophecies would have remained mere predictions, making a promise to our ear and breaking it to our hopes. Everything must be yea and amen in Christ Jesus. So it is too when we come to the New Testament. The *fact* of an accomplished righteousness wrought out in Christ must, of course, underlie any mere account of it. If the Gospel were

---

* Sohor. Genes. fol. 31.

† "Ye think," δοκειτε, more probably ye *suppose*. This word as here used is generally applied in the Gospels to some conceit of man's that needs be guarded against and corrected. Thus Matt. iii. 9. "Think not" (μη δόξητε) *i. e.*, suppose not wrongly "to say within yourselves we have Abraham to our father." Again, Matt. v. 6. "But when ye pray use not vain repetitions as the heathen do: for they think (δοκουσι) *i. e.* wrongly suppose they shall be heard for their much speaking." So throughout.

‡ ζω ήν αιωνιον. John v. 39, vide also John vi. 40, αίωνιον from αει always, and ων participle of ειμι to be. Always existing. Were the Scriptures themselves always existing? How can we predicate the "always existing life" except in the Λογος?

a mere statement without any fact corresponding with and answering to it, it would, of course, be a mere fiction. This accomplished redemption might be a reality without any written account of it, but the reverse of this is not true. Things are not only true because they are in the Bible, but in the Bible because they are true. The Kingdom of grace had an existence in fact and was working its results in the hearts of men and in the world long before any account of it was committed to parchment. Indeed a great part of the Bible is history which could not be recorded until after it had been enacted. It was a long time before this glorious work was commenced. The last book of St. John was not written until A. D. 96, and 393 years elapsed between the birth of Christ and the Œcumenical Council at Hippo, which separated the inspired writings from the spurious books that knocked for admission into the canon; so that St. Stephen and many others had gone to glory before one word of the New Testament had been written. Men could be saved then without the written word, but they could not be saved without the living Christ. Even now the ability to *read* is not necessary to salvation. Indeed the *preached* word is the ordained instrumentality by which Christ is to be presented to men, (Mark xvi. 15.) There may be different forms of announcing the Gospel, but it would be a fiction in any case, whether spoken or written, if there were no real facts answering to the declarations. This should not depreciate the Scriptures in our eyes to whom in these last times they have come, but only serve to place them in their proper relation, by showing that their true value rests in the historical realities of a Kingdom of grace whose head is a Personal Redeemer.

It seems strange that so many people are always confounding the Scriptures with Christ; that so many fail to see the relative position of the two in the economy of salvation, and that any attempt to make the proper distinction between the two is at once denounced as an attempt to depress the Bible below its proper valuation. And yet no one can have a just appreciation of God's written word except he sees it in its relation to the Word Incarnate. He may talk as piously as he

pleases about "precious promises," but after all they will be *nothing more* than promises unless there is a Saving One, in whom they find their fulfillment. And the failure of many such a man is, that he is always descanting with Pharisaic sanctimony upon "comforting doctrines," rather than pointing to "Him who is mighty to deliver."

A man may come to the Bible with his own preconceived notions of its teachings, as men generally do; or he may construct any theory out of the Scriptures. He may be a Calvinist or an Arminian, a Pedo-baptist or an Anabaptist; he may turn Pelagian if he is afraid of a sacramental grace, through which the natural depravity of children finds its counterpart in the Second Adam; he may even come with the self-constructed moulds of the Universalist. For notwithstanding all the praises with which the Bible is bespattered it is only, in the opinion of many, so much potter's clay, that every man may fashion as he listeth. Only so he is *sincere* and professes to hold the Bible as the only infallible rule of faith, no one else has a right to cavil. So great is the Diana of private judgment that all the world bows down before her; and baptizing latitudinarianism in the name of charity and freedom, renders this verdict: "You must agree to disagree; every man, especially in the United States, has a right to his honest convictions, and so the Bible can mean only what every man chooses to make it mean."

Meanwhile, even within the range of John Knoxian orthodoxy, the ranks of the sacramental host are bristling with the pikes and bayonets of controversy, and the Word of God is the armory from which all parties profess to bring their weapons. Professing Christians are contending for doctrines and phases of doctrines which lie away out in the periphery, while the personal Saviour—the great central Sun—is obscured by the dust and smoke of the conflict.* Men almost everywhere seem to be trying to work their way from and through theological

* We know it is often said in palliation of all this, "We agree on essential points and differ on non-essentials." But let any brother imagine his non-essentials are infringed upon in a union meeting or in the struggle for the spoils after a "joint

systems, into the Christological centre, rather than start with the Christological centre, and find in the person and work of Christ, the key to every mystery that lies beyond. No wonder, when they try to lead their congregations to Christ through labyrinths of doctrines, that the captains themselves should be confused and lost in the winding galleries, and the host refuse to follow. No wonder, if their salvation depends upon a system of theology rather than a Person, that they should bring all their powers of logic to uphold it, and display all their ornamental scholarship to embellish it. No wonder, if all is to stand in the reason of men, or in the poetical charm that oratory may give it, that they should set out to *prove* the gospel instead of *preaching* it, (Mark xvi. 15, Acts v. 43, 2 Tim. iv. 2), and to *make* the faith instead of *keeping* it. (1 Tim. vi. 20, 2 Tim. iv. 7). No wonder that they should fly entirely out of their orbits, running into the vagaries of sensational preaching, and finding or forcing a text to suit every flippant event that pops up before the public eye. All this may be very pleasant to itching ears, but there is no Christ in it.

Nor do we find any compensation for all this in the fact that this class of men make a great ado in preaching *about* preaching Christ, and claim the Apostles as their great exemplars. People are beginning to see through all this, notwithstanding the fact that the brother who "follows in prayer" may laud the evangelical spirit of "the brother who has just taken his seat," to the congregation, over the shoulders of the Almighty.

The Apostles never preached simply *about* preaching the gospel. "They ceased not to preach *Jesus Christ.*" (Acts v. 42). Any one who reads the sermons recorded in the book of Acts must be struck with their historical character; no speculation, no boasting of proclaiming good news without telling what the good news was, but matter of fact statements of who Christ is and what He has done to save man. And the epistles of Paul are full of epitomes which showed the good

---

effort" is over, and see if his regard for essentials will hold the non-essentials in abeyance. Which then are the essentials? Which shows itself to be the stronger force, the centrifugal or the centripetal? That which tends to the circumference, or binds to the centre?

news he proclaimed to be, not a syren song, but the great world fact, that God was manifested in the flesh for our redemption. "All things," he says, "are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given us the ministry of reconciliation: To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors," &c., (2 Cor. v. 18, et seq.). Again, "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is the word of faith which we preach: That if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus,"—not a theory but a Person—"that if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead"—the fundamental miracle of His triumph—"if thou shalt believe that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. x. 8).

Such quotations might easily be multiplied, but these will suffice to show that the gospel of the Apostles was not an empty sound. The facts of the Incarnation and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ were the truths they set forth. These facts gave the Scriptures their value in their minds. This was the value our Saviour Himself gave to them when He opened them to His disciples on the way to Emmaus, and caused their hearts to burn within them. For no other purpose did the Apostles use that which had been written before the coming of Christ. Thus in the synagogue of the Jews at Thessalonica, we are told, that "Paul, as his manner was, went in among them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again, and this Jesus whom I preach unto you is *Christ.*"

This was written all over the Old Testament Scriptures. It was the focal centre to which every ray converged. They everywhere and always pointed to the Christ of God. That Christ, with all their searching of their Scriptures, the Jews failed to recognize—a terrible warning to men in any age, who read the Bible for theories and systems upon which to rest in

the way of creed, without the least apparent conception that the written word without the Incarnate Word is a promise unfulfilled; and that if men are to have life at all it is not to be through a doctrine but through a *Person*.

The highest form of revealed truth is not in mere speech or theory, however Divine. To be an actualized reality for us it must become Incarnate. When the Apostle said, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself," he announced the great "*Mystery of Godliness*," that is, the sublime mysterious *fact* of an accomplished godly state and character, brought about by the infleshment of the second person of the Trinity. So Jesus says, "*I am* the way, the truth and the life." *I am* the *way*, i. e., the real at-one-ment of the Divine and human was effected in my conception by the Holy Ghost and my birth of the virgin Mary. God and man thus became one vitally in my person, and I am the only bond of union between the two. "No man knoweth the Son but the Father: neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the *Son* will reveal Him;" and "no man cometh to the Father but by me." So too I *am* the *truth*, that is, I am the absolute truth, as God in His essential Being is the absolute truth, and as man raised up in my person to correspondence with the character of God is the realization of truth. Here is the *living Truth*. So too, again, He says, *I am* the *life*, setting forth the fact that the life was in the constitution of His Person. And in His Person, rather than in any mere theory about Him, men are to find the principle and never-failing fountain of life. The most "evangelical" passages of Scripture, as men call them, prove this. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in *Him* should not perish but have everlasting *life*." "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in *Him* should not perish but have eternal *life*." (John iii). "In Him was life, and *the life was the light of men*." (John i. 4).

Men just reverse this, and here is a fundamental error that has wrong-shipped much of the theology of the day; a tap root

from which not only theoretical heresies but practical evils have long been growing. The common conception is that the *light is to be the life of men*—just the *reverse* of what the apostle tells us in the passage quoted above. This conception starts out with a doctrine rather than a person, whereas the Bible itself, always represents life as flowing to us only by union with Him, who *is* Himself our life. Col. iii. 4.

Now according to the organic constitution of the church which is to increase mainly from within itself, our children are baptized into Him before they are capable of receiving instruction. In the case of adults who are out of Christ, there must be now, as in the beginning, a preaching of the Gospel. This is intended to proclaim Christ *to* them and bring them *to* Him, but, besides this, they must be implanted *into* Him. This cannot be effected by any mere instruction or illumination. If we are to be raised from death to life, it must be by some transaction on the part of God, by which we, who are *really dead* in trespasses and sins, may be just as *really quickened.* Eph. ii. 1.

This is well illustrated in the history of Nicodemus. He was a "master in Israel," and came to Jesus by night, and said, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a *teacher* come from God, for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." How promptly our Saviour turns his thoughts away from *teaching*, as something entirely insufficient, to a new *life* as the essential thing: "Verily, verily I say unto thee, except a man be *born again* he cannot see the kingdom of God." How essentially He makes the life to be the light of men! And whatever was the confusion in the mind of this learned man,—however he was disposed to ask "How can these things be?" our Saviour still insists upon the fact to which He at the first, attached His double Amen:—that a man must be *born of* the *water and the Spirit* in order even to enter the kingdom of God. (John iii).

The life then comes before the light. The life is to become the light of men, and not the light the life of men. To be in Christ is the first thing, and then the light will come. "Then shall we know if we follow on to know the Lord. His going

forth, is prepared as the morning."* "I am the light of the world," says Jesus. "He that followeth *me* shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the *light of life*."† "I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on *me* should not abide in darkness."‡ "If any man do His will, he shall know the doctrine whether it be of God."§ "The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day."‖

And is not God wisest and best after all? Is it not a gracious provision that the life of God, lost to us in the first Adam, is brought back to us in the second Generic Head of our race? Could we find any comfort or have any salvation in view of the awful *fact* of sin and death that has blighted our humanity, if the life and grace given to us in the God-man were any less a reality? And is not the very *order* of God's grace the best? Is it not a glorious thing for our dear little children, that the life is to be the light of men; and that this life may be made over to them by a sacramental transaction before their undeveloped minds can even try to grasp it? Any scheme that makes the light to be the life of men, excludes them at least, whatever else may be said of it? Thank God for their sake, that the life ante-dates the light; that in the sphere of grace as well as in the sphere of nature, the life underlies and precedes all consciousness and all knowledge; and that the life thus given them may be nourished by the milk of the word, and then fed by that bread which nourishes to life eternal.

The whole scheme of the Heidelberg Catechism is built on this order. *First* it asks, "What is thy only comfort in life and death?" and *afterward*, "How many things are necessary for thee to know, that thou, enjoying this comfort, mayest live and die happy?" This order was in Paul's mind too, when he said he counted all things but loss, that he might apprehend that for which he was apprehended of Christ Jesus; (Phil. iii.

---

* Hosea vi. 3. † John viii. 12. ‡ John xii. 46. § John viii. 17. ‖ Prov. iv. 18.

12) as if Christ's mysterious power had *first laid hold of him*, with a purpose of his salvation, and now he was striving to come to a full *realization* of that salvation. This is the order that makes *grace* prominent. First the love of God *constituting us children*, by making the life that was in His Son over to us by the Holy Ghost, and then our recognition of Him as "Our Father who art in Heaven." First the life and then the light; and that life, not the mere ordering of our outward conduct,* but the vital principle of God's own being mediated to man through His own dear Son:—that life, not a mere intellectual scheme to be held up before the mind for study, but the real life of Christ brought into us by a regenerating act that makes us sons of God, and without which, all our prayers to Him as "Our Father" are appeals to a relation that does not exist; that life, without which all claims to "sonship" and consequent "heirship" are false.

To Christ, then, who "*is our Life*," the Scriptures point us. "They are they which testify of me," says Christ, who had a higher regard for them than the Jews whom he rebuked. This is their chief value, according to their own prominent declarations. They are called, "*The book of the Revelation* of *Jesus Christ*."† Nay more, "*The book* of *the* GENERATION *of Jesus Christ*,"‡ that is, the book of the conception and birth of Him, who in our human nature, put forth His Divine power for our redemption; and as the life which He brought into the world becomes our life, they are the book of the *re*-generation of man. "He that believeth on the *Son of God* hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made Him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of His Son. And *this is the record*, that God hath given to us *eternal life*, and *this life is in His Son*. He that *hath the Son*, *hath life*, and he that *hath not the Son* hath not life,"§ his biblical knowledge and theological acquirements to the contrary notwithstanding.

---

* As when Paul speaks of the *manner* of his life, from his youth. Acts xxvi. 4.

† Rev. i. 1. ‡ Matt. i. 1. § 1 John, v. 10—12.

"*This is life eternal*, that they may know *Thee, the only true God*, and *Jesus Christ*, whom Thou hast sent."*

He is the One "In whom" that is, in the CONSTITUTION of WHOSE PERSON "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,"† and "ye are *in Christ Jesus*, who of God, is made *unto us* wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption."‡

ART. II.—SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

From the Accession of Henry VIII. to the End of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth.§

BY REV. J. W. SANTEE.

IN the XVIth Century, history records the commencement, progress and result of a revolution, on the Continent of Europe, as well as in the sea-girt isle, which came down to us, styled a Reformation on a broad scale, by which we have introduced a new order of government for the Church, a reform in doctrine, and which claims to have set free the human mind, before fettered and bound by priestcraft and popery. The results, brought about in a short time, were truly wonderful, which in Germany, Holland, England and Scotland, changed the relation in which, prior to this, the State stood to the Church, and the Church, in these countries, stood to the Pontiff at Rome. Whatever may have been the corruptions found in the Roman Catholic Church—whatever may have been the relations in which the Princes and Emperors stood to the See of Rome, one thing is certain, that in a very short period of time, we have a complete overthrow of the old order, which held for nearly sixteen centuries, and the introduction of something new.

---

* John xvii. 3. † Col. ii. 3. ‡ 1 Cor. i. 30.

§ *Sources.* Dr. Schaff's Lect. on Ch. Hist. Hallam's Const. Hist. of England. Agnes Strickland, Lives of the Queens of England, &c., &c.

In order to effect such a radical change in the order, as it stood prior to this upheaval, it will be necessary to understand the springs and forces, lying far back in former history, which were quietly, yet powerfully, at work, that we may trace their progress in preparing the way, which in so short a space of time brought to pass such results. The English Reformation always claimed and still lays stress, on what was supposed to be fact, that here a history is presented which preserves a clear and unbroken succession from Apostolic days; and as the charge is made, once and again, that, in proportion, as we, in the German Reformed Church become churchly, and plant ourselves on true and solid Protestant ground, in opposition to the insecure and dangerous position of the larger portion of our common Protestantism, we must become Episcopal, or in other words, must lose ourselves in that branch of the Church, let us endeavor to institute an inquiry into the history of this Reformation and try to have a clear coast and a fair sea for sailing.

EARLY HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

It is not to be conceived, that such a revolution as that described by historians, could be effected, without a preparation of years beforehand, so as to reach such results. Our Christianity, to be worthy of any consideration, must be historical, and not dug out fresh from the Bible by some ingenious inventor. It must come down in the long line of the Ages, from its Holy Founder, and we cannot conceive of it as springing, *de novo*, from the brain of any one, in any land or country, after the fashion of our miserable sects.* Accordingly, we find Christianity introduced into Britain in very early times, indeed by some, it is claimed that the Blessed Gospel was brought

* A very curious passage occurs in a paragraph taken from the address of Luther against the Iconoclasts as follows: "You ought to know that you are to listen to no one but to me. With the help of God, Doctor Martin Luther has advanced first in the new way; the others followed after him: they ought to exhibit the docility of disciples, as their duty is to obey. *It is to me that God has revealed His Word: it is out of my mouth that it has proceeded free from all stain.*" This is singularly strange.

thither by some one of the College of Apostles.* This claim, however, rests upon a foundation so slender that there is much "to oppose," and cannot be historically maintained, and is now generally given up. From history, it seems that there were two epochs in the introduction of Christianity into Britain, linking themselves, in an historical way, to the past, and so to Apostolic times. It is more than probable, that nothing was known of Christianity in the island before the years 176 or 180 after Christ, and that it was brought thither under the direction and advice of Eleutherius, at the request of Lucius, a British king.† British writers tell us, that late in the second century, two missionaries, Fugatius and Damian, were sent with commissions from Eleutherius to England, and through their ministrations great numbers of the people were converted to the faith, and that by them the foundation of Christianity was laid in England. Another epoch of greater importance, in bringing positive Christianity into England, as Dr. Schaff tells us in his Lectures on Church-History, we have near the close of the 6th century. Augustine, with a band of forty assistants, landed in England, having been sent thither by Pope Gregory, and by whose labors, Ethelbert, the king of Kent, embraced Christianity. His example was imitated by many of his subjects, and subsequently these devoted men, extended their labors successfully over the whole island. During this period and by the labors of these men, the important Sees of Canterbury, York and London were founded, and brought into direct relation to the Chair of St. Peter; that the English or Anglican Church connects itself with early Christianity, and Apostolic times, and has this succession through the influence of Rome, or the Chair of St. Peter. Thus far, there are two epochs in the introduction of Christianity into England, the British and the

---

* "Now against this mass of testimony, to show that the Apostles (one of whom in this expedition, was certainly Paul, the *tent-maker*) established Christianity in Britain, there is nothing whatever to oppose." Ministerial Commission. By Rev. Lloyd Windsor, A. M., p. 135.

† Speaking of the petition made by the king to Eleutherius, Bede says, "Obsecrans, ut per ejus mandatum Christianus efficeretur: et mox effectum piæ postulationis consecutus est."

Anglo-Saxon, but both proceeded from the established order as found in these regularly constituted bishops. The "Succession" from the start, is not difficult to be made out, for the regular line is clear and easily traced, but the task becomes far more difficult when attempted through the period in which the upheaval really took place.

It may not be uninteresting to understand in what relation these British churches, founded by the authority of Eleutherius, and those by Augustine, under Pope Gregory, stood to the Pontiff at Rome. The establishment of these different sees, especially Canterbury, offered a great centre of authority and power to the Church. It is asserted by D'Aubigne in his History of the English Reformation, that these British churches were subjected by force, to the See of Canterbury, and so to the Pope at Rome, by the agency of Augustine and his colleagues or their successors, but this statement is incorrect, as the history shows.* Efforts, however, were made to bring these British churches, after an existence of nearly 400 years, to acknowledge the authority of the Roman Pontiff and to enter the pale of Catholic Unity, but all without any effect: Augustine died in 605, and it was eight years after the death of this man of God, that the war, which proved so disastrous to these churches, took place, of which D'Aubigne speaks. Eight years after the death of Augustine, in 613, the pagan king of Northumbria, named Edelfrid, "stimulated by vengeance against the Britons, for having given shelter to the heir of a rival claimant of his crown," besides his hatred of them, invaded their country, and in a great battle at Chester, conquered them, and while this was transpiring he discovered that the monks of Bangor were praying for the success of the British; that then, he caused his troops to fall upon them, which they did, and massacred them by hundreds.† Dr. Schaff tells us,

---

* The History of D'Aubigne of this movement in England, as well as his history of the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland, is so one-sided, as to be unreliable and wholly unsatisfactory.

† Bede says: "Ipso Augustino jam multo ante tempore ad cœlestia regna sublato."

that among the Britons, Christianity was never vigorous—that anarchy reigned among them, which corresponds with what historians tell us, as Gildas, a countryman of the Britons, "that the British clergy were exceedingly profligate in their morals, and many of them were addicted to morals which were a disgrace to the priestly character. They openly bought or sacrilegiously seized upon the dignities of the Church. They were ignorant and indolent, and in general all ecclesiastical discipline was greatly relaxed among them." The ecclesiastical order, as we have it in Augustine and his men, was more vigorous and of a far higher character than that of the Britons, and in whatever they may have been wanting, their morals and discipline were superior. It need not be wondered at, that efforts were made to extend this authority and the influence of the Roman Pontiff, and that, in the nature of the case, the weaker had to yield to the stronger. Error and systems mixed with it, can never stand against the true light, neither could these British churches, governed as they were, stand against the vigorous life and power of that form which stood in such close connection with the See of Rome. Attempts were made to bring them into subjection and thus under proper authority, in a Conference held with them on the borders of Wales, and the demands made, were reduced to three points: "that they should observe the orthodox computation of Easter: that they should conform to the Roman rite in the administration of Baptism, and join with Augustine and his colleagues, in preaching the Gospel to the Saxons." These demands were refused, and like heresies of old gradually disappeared, so did these British clergy disappear, unwilling, as they were, to be reformed and brought under proper authority. This then leaves an open sea, and from henceforth, we have authority as exercised from the See of Canterbury, which stood under the control of Rome, and extended itself over the whole island.* As the Anglo-Saxon Church was now established, her interests were specially

* That the Church of Rome, did, at an early period try to extend its power where it could, is beyond all doubt; that it did in after times obtain a spiritual supremacy in England, is equally unquestionable."—Bishop Short.

guarded by the Pope at Rome, and princes and people, clergy and bishops acknowledged this authority. This was not a pretended authority, but an authority that was exercised, and this claim and the exercise of it, reaches through the long period from near the close of the 6th, to the Norman Conquest, the middle of the 11th century. In order to place this point beyond controversy, it is asserted, and has not been disproved, "that during these intervening ages, no less than eight Saxon kings made a pilgrimage to Rome to receive the benediction of the Pope, while others sent their ambassadors to the Chair of St. Peter, and on the other hand, legates were sent from Rome to England, to settle difficulties, and regulate discipline." As evidence of this, we have the case of Wilfrid, bishop of York, when deposed unjustly by Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, appealing to Rome.* Though deprived of his see, for some time, by the instigation of the king and his enemies, the fact is clear that he looked to Rome for redress, and that the voice of the Pope was heard by the Church with respectful obedience. Another example, somewhat similar, we have in the case of St. Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury, in which case the authority of Rome was heard in its settlement. There cannot be the shadow of doubt, that Bishop Short is correct, "that Rome obtained spiritual supremacy over the land," but now, dangers of another order, were arising, and became more formidable with time, and which continued to increase, until the rupture with Rome actually took place.

So far England had been governed by numerous monarchs, who, at times, as it pleased them, took liberties with the sacred rights of the Church. About the middle of the 11th century we have a change of this whole former order, by William, the Norman, who effected the conquest of England. Power before was divided among the different rulers, now it became centralized, and was made to rest in the sole person of the monarch.

---

* "St. Wilfrid was deposed at the instance of Egfrid, king of Northumberland, who was instigated thereto by his unprincipled wife, Ermenburga, whom Wilfrid had grievously offended by endeavoring to curb her vices, and to put an end to her grievous scandals."

A strange contest now commenced. Kings, who have no scruples of conscience, have little regard for the sacred rights of the Church. This fact now comes clearly out. William, it is said, wielded his sceptre with an iron arm, and as his successors did, he attempted to interfere with spiritual matters, and to bring into bondage the clergy of the Church. It is truly wonderful, how seed, sown long ages back, will lie inactive, until conditions are suited to call it into life. Already, under the Saxon kings, attempts were made to encroach on the sacred rights of the Church, which were now renewed with more vigor and force, and which led at last to the rupture itself. This spirit of encroachment underlies the history, indeed, from the very start on to the time of Henry VIII, and it is necessary to understand it, in making up the account of this wonderful movement.

The principles which were insisted on, in the ages preceding the Norman dynasties, we have clearly and fully stated by Lingard, in his Antiquities. "By Theodore, the discipline of the Saxon Church was reduced to a more perfect form. The choice of bishops was secured to the national Synods, in which the primate presided and regulated the process of election. Gradually it devolved to the clergy of each church, whose choice was corroborated by the presence and acclamations of the more respectable of the laity. But the notions of the feudal jurisprudence incessantly undermined the freedom of these elections. As it was dangerous to intrust the Episcopal power to the hands of the enemy, the king forbade the consecration of the bishop elect, till the royal consent had been obtained; and as the revenues of the church were originally the donation of the crown, he claimed the right of investing the new prelate with the temporalities of his bishopric. As soon as any church became vacant, the ring and crozier, the emblems of Episcopal jurisdiction, were carried to the king by a deputation of the chapter, and returned by him to the person whom they had chosen, with a letter by which the civil officers were ordered to maintain him in the possession of the lands belonging to his church. The claims of the crown were progressive. By de-

grees the royal will was notified to the clergy of the vacant bishopric, under the modest veil of a recommendation in favor of a particular candidate, at last, the rights of the chapter were openly invaded; and before the fall of the Anglo-Saxon dynasty, we meet with instances of bishops appointed by the Sovereign, without waiting for the choice, or soliciting the consent of the clergy." Lingard's *Antiquities*, p. 47.

This extract gives us a flood of light, and the after history clearly teaches, that, interfering with the privileges and liberties of the Church, the Norman and Saxon kings were slow to relinquish the privilege, and we find the same state of things in the time of Henry VIII, under the reign of Queen Elizabeth, down even to our day, where we have the subjection of the Church to the State or the Crown, so that understanding it clearly, we have the key whereby to explain the success which attended the efforts and brought to pass the rupture, though sternly and earnestly resisted by the established authority as we have it in the Roman See. We do not believe in the theory, at times advocated, that the State is superior to the Church, but, that the Church is the Kingdom "which is to endure forever." We have this principle underlying the contests in the middle ages, which were carried on between the Emperors and the Popes, and there is no doubt, that it was to the well-being of society, and the advantage of the cause of truth, and of the Church, that there was no flinching on the part of the Popes, and that, generally the State had to yield. Not so, however, in these contests in Britain. What the result has been in the way of consequence, is now open to the world. It needs no eye with gifted power to see, that vast injury would accrue to the Church by allowing the secular power to interfere and dictate as to her rights. The chief form of encroachment came from the election of Bishops. Unworthy men, from impure, selfish motives, often gained the ear of the king and obtained appointments, to the injury of the Church and the cause of true Christianity. The misery of these wicked schemes came to the surface gradually, and hastened on towards fruit.

After the accession of William, the Church was ably cared

for by the stern and determined Lanfranc, then Archbishop of Canterbury, an Italian by birth, a most learned, pious and prudent man. It seems that he had nerve sufficient to insist on the rights belonging to the Church, and could not be influenced by the court, neither would he take counsel of flesh and blood. Overawed as the King was, by this man of God, William proved to be a friend and protector to Lanfranc in his struggles with the Norman barons. Unflinching, in his character, "he succeeded in rooting out abuses, restoring discipline, advanced the cause of learning, overawed disaffection and checked the rapacity of the hungry adventurers, who had come over in the train of the Conqueror." He stood in the closest relations to the Chair of St. Peter, and acted under Papal authority. During this time, Oderic tells us: "that he refrained from seizing on the revenues of vacant bishoprics and abbeys, protected them from the rapacity of his barons, and named a successor with the advice of the principal clergy." As time passed on and opportunity offered, the real spirit of the King showed itself in this form. "He would not permit the authority of any particular Pontiff to be acknowledged in his dominions without his previous approbation: and he directed that all letters issued from the court of Rome, should, on their arrival, be submitted to the royal inspection; and so jealous was he of any encroachment on his authority, that without the royal license he would not permit the decisions of the national or provincial councils to be carried into effect; he forbade the regular ecclesiastical courts to implead or excommunicate any individual holding in chief of the crown until the nature of the offence had been certified to himself." This is an advance—progress. The nature of the contest becomes more clear, and the danger threatening the Church becomes more apparent. With these foundations firmly laid, William died, and was succeeded, as Emperor, by his son Rufus, or William II, in whose reign, that which before had been hidden, now came to light in various enactments, in which the crown encroached boldly on the rights of the Church. It is said, as a ruler, he was licentious, extravagant and reckless. As long as God spared to the Church, the bold and energetic pri-

mate Lanfranc, who administered the See of Canterbury, the King observed some regard for the rights of the Church, but two years after his accession, in 1089, the venerable Archbishop fell asleep, free rein was assumed by the King, and he openly trampled law and order under foot, and made bold advances in trenching on ecclesiastical rights. Licentious, as he was, he scrupled not to seize on the revenues of the Church and vacant benefices to supply himself with money "for his own selfish gratification and for squandering among his guilty favorites." In order to make the most out of them, he unscrupulously kept bishoprics and abbeys vacant for years, little caring what injury would result to the Church and her members. As the See of Canterbury was an important one, and its revenues large, he kept it vacant for four long years, when Providence interfered by prostrating him on a bed of sickness which brought him nigh unto death, and becoming alarmed, he relented and gave his consent to the appointment of the sainted monk Anselm to the vacant See. These holy men, always zealous for the rights of the Church, contended to the last, and after much entreaty Anselm accepted the arduous duties of the See, only on condition, that the King would give back the property of the Church, unlawfully seized, and acknowledge Urban II, as the lawful Pontiff. While upon his sick bed, confronted with death, the King readily acceded. As if to put his sincerity to the test, the crisis of his disease was passed over and the King was restored, but then, as now, sick persons make promises readily and willingly which, when well, they are unwilling to fulfil. So it was with the King. Having passed the crisis, and restored to health, the King became more rapacious than before, and unscrupulously seized on the revenues of the Church, and in order to gratify his wicked spirit, he kept these sacred offices vacant during his pleasure. But there was no compromise with these holy men. Anselm stood firm and unyielding. The King on the other side was obstinate, and in every way attempted to get the incumbent of the See out of the way, by having him deposed, but this man of God remained firm. To show how unscrupulous the King was, and what endeavors were made to carry his point, the Pri-

mate being supported by the barons, who defended him, the King wrote to the Pope, acknowledging him as Pontiff, and promising him a rich pension if he would consent to depose Anselm. But his point was not easily gained, for the Pope, true to his office, indignantly spurned the bribe, and was unwilling to be instrumental in punishing a man who was innocent, and who battled for the rights of the Church. Anselm saw, that with such an unscrupulous enemy the contest would be against the Church. He then, in 1097 left the Kingdom, and came to the feet of the Pope, and there offered the following reasons: "The King would not restore to my Church those lands belonging to it which he had given away after the death of Lanfranc; he even continued to give more away, notwithstanding my opposition; he required of me grievous services, which had never been required of my predecessor: he annulled the law of God and the canonical and apostolical decisions, by customs of his own creation. In such conduct I could not acquiesce, without the loss of my own soul: to plead against him in his own court was vain; for no one dared to assist or advise me. This then is my object in coming to you, to beg that you would free me from the bondage of the episcopal dignity, and allow me to serve God again in the tranquillity of my cell; and that in the next place, you would provide for the Churches of the English, according to your wisdom and the authority of your station." We cannot follow in detail the history of these men. We merely wish to trace this growing spirit, and to show how earnestly the Church resisted it. The successor of William II, followed in the same track of his predecessors, reviving these claims to the bishoprics and abbeys, and after a contest long and faithfully carried on, Anselm, the man of God, fell asleep and went to his reward, in 1109. A history somewhat similar, we have in the stern and unflinching Thomas à Becket, made Archbishop of Canterbury in 1162, and who, because, he boldly resisted King Henry II, in his encroachments, was obliged to fly the Kingdom when he betook himself to the Pontiff at Rome; by whom arrangements were made for the return of the exiled primate, which he did, but only to become, shortly after, a martyr, "as-

sassinated, as he was at the foot of his own Cathedral altar by courtly assassins." A history somewhat akin to this we have in that of Edmund Rich. What a contest, and with what vigor carried on, in defence of rights, sacred to the cause of Christ. Venerable men and worthy of all honor, for their noble fight against the crown, and defending the rights of the Church. In what contrast, does not this noble, martyr spirit stand, when confronted with the cowardly spirit shown by the ministry during our late rebellion, when the ordained minister, by the authority of the government, was dragged from his office, thus overriding the Church, and thrust unceremoniously into the rank and file of the army. A dark spot this, on our *Christian* spirit, as a people. By those men, in these former days, the rights of the Church meant something with which neither the crown, nor any other secular power had any right to interfere. This right, the Church never yielded. She claims it to this day.

Such was the spirit, and after this fashion things continued, until near the middle of the 14th century, when a series of enactments were passed by the English Parliament, between 1343 and 1393, under Edward III, and Richard II, entitled "Statutes of Provision or Præmunire." The king was jealous of the authority of the Pope, and hence the acts of 1343, and afterward under Edward III, "forbade, under penalty of forfeiture, and subsequently of outlawry, the bringing into the kingdom of such letters of provision for vacant benefices, or of documents of any other description which should be deemed contrary to the rights of the monarch and of the realm; and provided that the election to vacant sees and abbeys should be nominally free, but that the king should have the bestowal of the vacant benefice whenever the Pope interfered, and the lay patron neglected to select the incumbent." Matters were converging to a focus, and in 1393 the famous statute of Præmunire was drawn up in Parliament and left to be carried out at the discretion of the king, with the advice of his council. By this statute "it was provided, that if any man pursue or obtain in the Court of Rome, or elsewhere, such translations, excommunications, bulls, instruments or other things against the king's

crown and regality or kingdom as aforesaid, or bring them into the realm, or execute them either within the realm or without, such person or persons, their notaries, procurators, fautors or counsellors shall be out of the king's protection, their goods and chattels, lands and tenements shall be forfeited to the king, and their persons attached wherever they may be found." In all these controversies, and in these encroachments, it almost invariably turned out, that the advantage remained with the king and weakened the powers of the Pontiff, and deprived the clergy of that dignity and honor, which they had a right to claim, as "stewards of the mysteries of God." Before, the Church suffered somewhat, now she suffered more. Elections to vacant offices often amounted to nothing; worldly-minded men succeeded to gain possession of them, and thus were wholly dependent on the caprices of the king; who, for one moment, would hesitate to decide between appointments thus made and those made by the Pope. Such men as Anselm, à Becket, Rich and others are not to be brought into comparison with men filling these sees and abbeys, who were ever ready to do the bidding of unprincipled kings.* That these men discharged their solemn trusts, as became bishops and stewards, is witnessed to, by writers, both Roman Catholic and Protestant. Mr. Foss, speaking of Lanfranc, says, "He was not only willingly accepted by the monks and approved by the barons and people, but gladly confirmed by the Pope. * * On his return from Rome, he devoted himself strenuously to the duties of his office, and labored successfully in reforming the irregularities and rudeness of his clergy. His severity in depriving many, occasioned considerable complaints, but the introduction of foreign scholars in their places contributed effectually to the enlightenment of the nation." Of Simon, of Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury, murdered by an English mob under Richard II, Mr. Foss says: "The character of the

* It is said of the clergy in Germany, and the same is applicable to the clergy in England, thus: "It cannot be denied that, whatever the national writers may say to the contrary, the ecclesiastics appointed by the Pope were generally far superior, as regards both merit and conduct, to those nominated by the chapter or bishops." Hist. Germanic Empire, Vol. 2, Ch. 3.

archbishop, as represented by the historians, was such, as to make him least liable to popular hatred. He was a liberal, free and generous spirit; admired for his wonderful parts, for his wisdom, his learning and his eloquence, and revered for the piety of his life, the charity he dispensed, and the merciful consideration he always exhibited."

How this spirit progressed, and gradually prepared the way and cast off the authority of Rome, we have in Acts, as early as 1315. "At that time came into England two legates. As the manner of the Romans is, they ride with great solemnity into the north country, for to make Lodewick Beaumont, bishop of Durham, against the election of the monks who had chosen another. And, though they were warned that they should not come there, yet they rode till they came to Darlington. And sodeynly out of a vail rose a great people—Capteyns Gilbert de Middleton and Walter Selby. They laid hands on them, and robbed them of all their treasure; and Lodewick, whom they intended to make bishop, they led to a town called Morpath, and compelled him to make a grete ransom. Then came the cardinal to London, and asks of the clergy eight pence in the mark, by way of compensation for their loss. They were answered with a sneer, "that they gave them no counsel for to go so far north." How completely all power centered in the crown, and what pernicious fruit it began to bear, we have in examples like the following: "In the reign of Edward I, the King demanded *one-half* the annual revenue of the clergy. A Knight rose up in the midst of the convocation, and said: 'My venerable men, this is the demand of the King, the moiety of the annual revenue of your Churches. And if any one objects to this let him rise up in the middle of the assembly, that his person may be recognized and taken note of, as he is guilty of treason against the King's peace.' When they heard this, all the prelates were disturbed, and immediately agreed to the King's demands." And well might they. By degrees the power of the Roman See was so much weakened, that the authority of the Pope was only nominal, and could not be of any practical benefit in selecting good men for vacant bishoprics and

exercising and enforcing proper discipline. This spirit came to its head in the reign of Henry VIII, gathering such force through centuries past, that a writer already quoted remarks: "As we advance towards the Reformation, we see the spirit of slavery stealing over men's minds, taking its origin from a servile worship of the *visible*, embodied in an earthly sovereignty. The old English vigor of intellect and character was becoming palsied beneath the heavy chilling pressure of regal tyranny, and losing all its elastic energy and racy heartiness. In truth, these chronicles, taken altogether, throw a clear, strong light upon our English history; and the more that light is diffused, the more apparent will it be, that all the abuses of the Church, in that age, arose from servility to royalty; and from the virtual subjection of the episcopate, and that spirit of the world, which was afterwards formally embodied and enthroned and still is so, in the royal supremacy; in other words, all these mediæval chronicles are witnesses for the Papacy."

From these statements, it is clear that English Christianity came through the authority of Rome, and connects itself by regular succession through Rome to the early Church and apostolic times. Moreover, it is no less clear, that the difficulties in the English Church, for ten centuries, were caused by an unlawful interference of the temporal with the spiritual, and that in these contests, the Pontiffs were clearly in the right, and were battling for the rights of the Church, as well as the freedom and spiritual liberty of the individual, while the Kings, generally, were selfish, actuated by impure motives, anxious to rob the Church of her rights—degrade the ministry to a secular office, and secularize her property and devote it to unholy and unlawful purposes. What untold miseries resulted from this secularization in England and in Germany, let *impartial* history determine. The seed sown in the ages past, nurtured and fostered, as it was, by the secular spirit, was now ready to bloom and yield fruit under the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Queen Elizabeth.

ACCESSION OF HENRY VIII.

It is now easy to see, with such preparation, that little was wanting to draw the lines so clearly and distinctly, as to shut out the Roman power, full of tyranny, as was supposed, and concentrate all power in the person of the King or Queen, far more arbitrary and tyrannical. It cannot be disputed, with any sort of truth, that this power would have been safer, exercised by the Roman See, than to be vested in the hands of unscrupulous and selfish Kings and Queens. How ends are shaped, and what results are made to hang on acts—this shall all appear in the brief sketch of this history, how the Reformation really was commenced, carried on, and actually consummated.

Henry VIII, ascended the throne of England in 1509. In his reign the rupture with Rome formally took place. We have seen the condition of the church and her relation to the Kings who successively ruled. Now, who was Henry VIII, and what part did he perform in this wonderful movement? As to the character of this King, it is too late in the day to attempt from history, intelligibly understood, a defense of his character, as recently by Froude in his History of England; we shall read it as portrayed by impartial historians, whether the picture will be pleasant or not. During his reign we find the position of the church, as formerly held, wholly changed, whether for better or worse, and spiritual power vested in the King instead of the Pontiff. Says Bishop Short: "The chief mover of the Reformation in this country was a King brought up with a high respect and admiration for those doctrines which were combated by the Reformers, who had publicly embarked in their defense, and acquired the title of Defender of the Faith," &c., ... "the existence of the church of England as a distinct body, and her final separation from Rome, may be dated from the period of the divorce." We have the same in the Book of Homilies. "Honor be to God, who did put light in the heart of *his true and faithful minister*, of most famous memory, King Henry the Eighth, and give him the knowledge of His word, and an earnest affection to seek His glory, and to put away all such superstitious and pharisaical sects, by antichrist invented, and

set up against the true word of God, and glory of His most blessed name, as He gave the like spirit to the most noble and famous princes Josaphat, Josias, and Ezechias." How earnest he was for the "knowledge of God and His word," and "affection to seek His glory," we shall see in the sequel.

Henry VIII, had every preparation for a splendid reign. Of a fine appearance, an education more than ordinary, he had before him a brilliant future. He was married to Catharine of Arragon, it is said, "a virtuous woman of noble lineage and lofty bearing." Related, as she was, to Charles V, his Kingdom was brought into close alliance with that of Spain, one of the most powerful and wealthiest Kingdoms of Europe. Not only was he qualified for the affairs of government, but when Luther had attacked the Papal Church, Henry VIII eagerly took up his pen and wielded it in defense of the Pope, against Luther, and having laid his first offering of this kind at the feet of the Pope, he obtained from him the title *Fidei Defensor*. For eighteen long years he lived peaceably and happily with his lawful wife Catharine, against whose character neither friend nor foe dared say aught. But all at once, after this time had elapsed, suddenly, the conscience of the King became alarmed, discovering, as he thought he had, that he had been living unlawfully with Catharine.* It seems, however, that he had been captivated by one of the Queen's maids of honor, Anne Boleyn, possessing qualities of person which she knew too well how to manage, to decoy the King and supplant his lawful wife. The question was, how to get rid of Catharine. To do it, two ways were open before him; either to kill her or divorce her. Sunk

---

* "Whether Henry really felt any scruple respecting the validity of his marriage during the first eighteen years of his reign, may be reasonably doubted. No trace of such doubts can be discovered in his public conduct, till the year 1527. Catharine had then passed the middle age; personal infirmities are mentioned, which might have widened the alienation. About the same time Anne Boleyn, a damsel of the court, at the age of twenty-two, in the flower of youthful beauty, and full of graces and accomplishments, touched the fierce, but not unsusceptible heart of the King. . . . . The light which shone from Anne Boleyn's eyes might have awakened or revived Henry's doubts of the legitimacy of his long union with the faithful and blameless Catharine. His licentious passions, by a singular operation, recalled his mind to his theological studies."—Sir James Mackintosh's *His. of England*, p. 222.

as he was, he recoiled from murdering her; a crime in which he became an expert, and he bent the energies of his mind to accomplish his purpose, by divorcing her. It is said, that before Wolsey and the clergy he plead scruples of conscience; to his Parliament, he alleged reasons of state policy and the dangers to the realm of a disputed succession. The real secret, no doubt, is given by Agnes Strickland: "Meantime a treatise on the unlawfulness of his present marriage was compounded by the King and some of his favorite divines. How painfully and laboriously the royal theologian toiled in this literary labyrinth, is evinced in a letter written by himself to the fair lady *whose bright eyes had afflicted him with such unwonted qualms of conscience* that he had been fain to add the pains and penalties of authorship to the cares of government for her sake." (*Lives of the Queens of England*, vol. iv. p. 142). About this time, one of those mysterious Providences visited the Kingdom, which confronted King and subject in such a way that there was no escape, in what is known as the "sweating sickness," during the prevalence of which, it seems, that he became conscience-smitten, his knees smiting together; when he quickly dismissed his mistress and recalled his lawful wife, with whom he united in all her daily devotions, went to confession, received the Holy Communion every week, and became reconciled to his friends.* His sincerity was soon put to the test when the danger had passed by, for he dismissed his lawful wife, and recalled his mistress Anne. The vital question was the divorce. The Universities were consulted in reference to the case; bribes were offered and received; trickery resorted to; yet withal, the answers, generally, were unfavorable to the King, because of the solemn denial by Catharine of the charges made against her. Whatever could be done with the Universities, and other emi-

* "If Anne was not actually his mistress at the time of the 'sweating sickness,' in 1528, she seems to have become such not long afterwards, at least during the three years previous to her marriage with the King. The marriage was hastened by the fact of her being suddenly found in a condition to give him an heir, the legitimacy of whose birth it was deemed of importance to place beyond doubt or cavil. . . . . Elizabeth was born a little over seven months after the date of the marriage."

nent persons, at Rome, on the Chair of St. Peter was seated Clement VII, whom nothing could influence. Though he had received from a former Pope the honorable title of *Fidei Defensor*, and was called his "dear son Henry," the Pope would not consent to the divorce nor allow him to have more than one wife, according to the law of God.* What a contrast with the Reformers on the Continent, in reference to the bigamy of the Landgrave of Hesse, sanctioning two wives, which we have in a document of twenty-four sections, ably drawn up, and signed by Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Martin Bucer, Antony Corvin, Adam, John Lenninger, Justus Winterferte, and Denis Melanther.†

Tytler gives us a graphic description of the last sitting of the Court for trying the divorce. "On the 23d of July, the legitimate Court met for the last time, and as it was generally expected by those ignorant of the intrigues at Rome that a decision would be pronounced for the King, the hall was crowded. Henry himself was present, but concealed behind the hangings, where he could hear all that passed. When the cardinals had taken their seats, his majesty's counsel demanded judgment; upon which Campeggio replied, that the case was too high and notable to be determined before he should have made the Pope acquainted with all the proceedings. 'I have not,' said he, 'come so far to please any man for fear, need or favor, be he King or any other potentate. I am an old man, sick, decayed, and looking daily for death. What should it then avail me to put my soul in danger of God's displeasure, to my utter damnation, for the favor of any prince or high estate in this world. For as much, then,

---

* "To all their remonstrances (of Henry's ambassadors) he (Pope Clement VII,) returned the same answer; that he could not refuse to Catharine, what the ordinary forms of justice required; that he was devoted to the King, and eager to gratify him in any manner conformable with law and equity; but that they ought not to require from him what was evidently unjust, or they would find that when his conscience was concerned, he was equally insensible to considerations of interest or of danger."

† "Anne, however, had her anxieties at this crisis, for the opinion of all Christendom was so much against the divorce that Henry was disposed to waver. Luther himself declared, 'that he would rather allow the King to take two wives than dissolve the present marriage.'". *Queens of England*, vol. iv. p. 163. She quotes Luther's *Epist. Halse*, 177, p. 290.

that I understand the truth in this case, is very difficult to be known, and that the defendant will make no answer thereunto, but has appealed from our judgment; therefore, to avoid all injustice and obscure doubts, I intend to proceed no further in this matter, until I have the opinion of the Pope, and such others of his council as have more experience and learning. For this purpose,' he concluded, rising from his chair, 'I adjourn the cause till the commencement of the next term, in the beginning of October.' There was now a doubt as to the course of the King, and Anne, fearful that he would relent, unprincipled as she was, did everything in her power to urge on the King to divorce his wife. To accomplish her end, she found a willing ally in Thomas Cromwell, the son of a fuller, who was raised, by Wolsey, from obscurity, and who succeeded in supplanting his benefactor. By the efforts of this man and his cunning intrigue, he succeeded in carrying the point and obtaining the divorce, and Anne became Queen of England, and Cromwell obtained power seldom reached by few. D'Aubigne speaks of two divorces, divorcing Catharine, his lawful wife, contrary to the voice of Christendom, which led to the rupture or brought to pass the second divorce, divorcing England from the centre of Catholic unity. Now all restraints were cast off. He was rid of the Pope, that thorn in his side,—of his legates, and an opportunity was offered to him to seize on the possessions of the church, thus ridding the people of a spiritual despot, in the person of the Pope, only to make room for a tyrant in church and state, who knew no bounds, and who was rapacious and unprincipled.* Now the ice was broken. Anne rejoiced in her success, but in the short space of four months, after the death of the divorced Catharine, Anne herself was divorced, and brought to the block as an adulteress and guilty of high treason. What an avenging of history. This was accomplished by Cranmer, whom Henry had made Archbishop

* Cardinal Pole, in his apology addressed to Charles V., mentions this act of unheard of cruelty—of Henry refusing to be softened either by the entreaties of Catharine or the tears of Mary into granting one final interview between mother and daughter. "Cum hoc idem filia cum lacrymis postuláret, mater vix extremum spiritum vitæ ducens flagitaret, quod hostis nisi crudelissimus nunquan negasset, conjux a viro, mater pro filia, impetrare non potuit."

of Canterbury, and who became a pliant tool in the hands of the King to carry out his infamous designs. All power cringed before the King, and even his parliament hesitated not to pronounce the offspring of Anne as illegitimate. Catharine divorced, Anne beheaded, room was made now for another queen, and she was soon found in Jane Seymour, to whom Henry was married the next morning after the execution of his "beloved Anne." Agnes Strickland says: "While the last act of that diabolical drama was played out, which consummated the destruction of poor Anne, it appears that her rival had the discretion to retreat to her paternal mansion, Wolf Hall, in Wiltshire. There the preparations for her marriage with Henry VIII were proceeding with sufficient activity to allow her royal wedlock to take place the day after the axe had rendered the King a widower. Henry himself remained in the vicinity of the metropolis, awaiting the accomplishment of that event. The traditions of Richmond Park, and Epping Forest quote each place as the locale of the following scene. On the morning of the 19th of May, Henry VIII, attired for the chase, with his huntsmen and hounds around him was standing under a spreading oak, breathlessly awaiting the signal gun from the Tower, which was to announce that the axe had fallen upon the neck of his once 'entirely beloved Anne Boleyn.' At last, when the bright summer sun rode high toward its meridian, the sullen sound of the death-gun boomed along the windings of the Thames. Henry started with ferocious joy. 'Ha, ha,' he cried with satisfaction, 'the deed is done! Uncouple the hounds and away.' The chase that day bent toward the West, whether the stag led it in that direction or not. At nightfall the King was at Wolf Hall, in Wiltshire, telling the news to his elected bride. The next morning the King married the beautiful Seymour. It is commonly asserted that he wore white for mourning the day after Anne Boleyn's execution; he certainly wore white, not as mourning, but because he on that day wedded her rival." Vol. 4, p. 219.

What humane heart does not revolt at such unheard of cruelty and brutishness? Who would be willing to call such a

character, a respecter of God and law," or to say "he had an affection to seek His glory?" What a page in this wonderful movement! Anne now was out of the way, Jane Seymour was Queen in her place, who gave birth to Edward VI,* and after her death, Henry married a German princess, Anne of Cleves. He became disgusted with her appearance, still married her, but soon had her divorced, Cranmer officiating as before. He became now displeased with his prime minister, who lost his head, having been the first victim of his own "law of attainder," and so made room for some one else to fill his place. From now Cranmer stands near the person of the King. The King next married Catharine Howard of the House of Norfolk. After a while he had her divorced, and then beheaded for the crime of treason. What hand his ministers had in divorcing his wives and beheading them is not fully known, but Agnes Strickland opens a window, letting in some light, as follows. "The early follies of Catharine were known to too many, not to have reached the persons most interested in destroying her influence with the King, and if they delayed in striking the blow that was to lay her honors in the dust, it was only to render it more effectual. The 'snake was to be killed, not scotched.' But on that fatal morrow, while Henry was at mass, the paper that contained the particulars of the misconduct of her whom he esteemed such a jewel of womanhood and perfect love to himself was put into his hands by Cranmer, with an humble request that he would read it when he was in entire privacy. . . . When this was reported to the King he sent Cranmer to her in the morning with a deceitful assurance, that if she would acknowledge her transgressions, the King, although her l fe had been forfeited by the law, had determined to extend unto her his most gracious mercy."

---

* When the hour came in which the heir of England was expected to see the light, it was by no means the 'good hour' so emphatically prayed for in the ceremonial of her retirement. After a martyrdom of suffering, the queen's attendants put to Henry the really cruel question of, whether he would wish the wife or infant to be saved. It is affirmed, and it must be owned the speech is too characteristic of Henry to be doubted that he replied, "The child by all means, for other wives could easily be found." Vol. 4, p. 288, *Queens of England.*

The last one in this catalogue, was Catharine Parr. Poor creature, she narrowly escaped with her life for daring to have an opinion of her own, and she had the good fortune of outliving the king, who had divorced four wives and led two to the block. This certainly, in all conscience, is enough, and where a man is sunk thus low, becoming debased so as to be brutish, we need not wonder that he would plunder, rob and steal. A conscience seared like his, would have allowed him to do at one blow, what, for prudential reasons, he had to do by degrees. To support himself in his licentious course, required large revenues to the crown, and in order to replenish his treasury, he coveted the wealth of the monasteries, "institutions which had been for centuries the nurseries of religion and learning, the comfort to the poor and forsaken," and from which some of the most pious and devoted men came forth. In 1536 a bill was introduced into the Parliament to give to the king the property of those monastic establishments whose annual revenue did not exceed 200 £ sterling. A good beginning. The bill soon passed the house of lords, but met much opposition in the commons. It is said, that Henry sent for the commons, and with a scowl told them that "he would have the bill pass or take off some of their heads." And why should he not, expert as he was, in such business? Terror seized the commons, the bill was passed, and Henry gained his points, thus breaking completely, the spirit of freedom and right for which the Church contended, and wresting all power out of legitimate hands, he made himself supreme both in Church and State. "They (the houses of Parliament) yielded to every mandate of Henry's imperial will; they bent with every breath of his capricious humor; they were responsible for the illegal trial, for the iniquitous attainder, for the sanguinary statute, for the tyranny which they sanctioned by law, and for that, which they permitted without law." Hallam, *Const. Hist. of England.* To gain possession of other property of the Church, we have plans and tricks. The monks were immoral, the monasteries were nests in which opposition to the realm and rebellion was hatched, they were suppressed, the

property secularized, the king and his courtiers parceled out among themselves the property thus seized upon and then went on in riotous living.* Of the destruction of the monasteries, Bishop Short says, "that it was an act of wanton avarice on the part of the king and nobility, and as disastrous in its immediate influence on religion and learning." The total number dissolved was eleven hundred, which yielded an annual revenue of about 150.000 £. Whether that amount would have been of more service in the hands of the Church, where it by right belonged, than in the hands of such a man as the king was, we let the impartial reader determine.

Having now seen the character of the king and how he succeeded in humbling all power and to trample all rights under his feet, it will be interesting also, to see how he stands related to the Church. Cromwell, promoted to the king's privy council, suggested to him that the bishops and clergy had incurred the penalties enacted in the famous statute of Præmunire, and that they, with their possessions, were entirely at his mercy. The king acted on this suggestion. He called a convocation of the clergy, who, in alarm, offered the king a present of 100.000 £. to be released from the dreaded penalties of the statute. But the bait would not take, unless they would insert a clause, "acknowledging him to be Supreme Head of the Church of England." It was compromised by inserting, "so far as the law of Christ will allow,' fully aware, that at the proper time, he could remove even that. Here is fruit of seed sown twelve centuries ago. More than this; Cromwell was "made spiritual vicar-general of the realm," and as such, he was placed over the heads of the clergy, and became, with the king, Supreme. The king now had everything in his hands—power

---

* "This would not have satisfied the ends of Henry and his covetous and ambitious agents. They all aimed at the revenues and riches of the religious houses, for which reason no arts or contrivances were to be passed by that might be of use in obtaining those ends. * * As the scheme was managed, therefore, it was a compromise or co-partnership of the king and his courtiers. The lands now lay the open prey of the hardy claimant or the sly intriguer; crowds of suppliants wearied the crown to participate in that national spoliation."—D'Israeli, *Amenities of Literature.*

in the Church and State emanated from the crown—the new vicar-general suggested that the powers of all the bishops be suspended, which was done by Cranmer, assigning as a reason, that a visitation of the dioceses would soon take place by Cromwell. What could the bishops do ? Their power was gone, and we are told, that within a month, under the working of such unholy conduct, "they humbly sued for new faculties from the king to enable them to govern their flocks." In consequence, a "commission was issued to each bishop separately, authorizing him, *during the king's pleasure, and as the king's deputy*, to ordain persons born within and admit them to livings ; to receive proof of wills ; to determine causes lawfully brought before ecclesiastical tribunals ; to visit the clergy and laity of the diocese ; to inquire into crimes and punish them according to the canon law ; and to do whatever belonged to the office of a bishop, besides those things, which, according to the Sacred Writings, were committed to his charge. The reason assigned was, not that the government of bishops is necessary for the Church, but that the king's vicar-general, on account of the multiplicity of business with which he was loaded, could not be everywhere present, and that many inconveniences might arise if delay and interruptions were admitted in the exercise of his authority." Was not the power of the Pope cast off, and is there not here a power, taking his place, which is riding them, and degrading, and stripping them of all ecclesiastical rights ? In order to establish himself firmly, and "dispel these prejudices, Henry issued injunctions that the very name of *Pope* should be carefully erased out of all books employed in the public worship : that every schoolmaster should diligently inculcate the new doctrine to the children entrusted to his care : that all clergymen, from the bishop to the curate, should on every Sunday and holiday teach, that the king was the true head of the Church, &c. &c." The Church now became the creature of the crown. The king was the Pope ! Accordingly, in the year 1536, a book was compiled, called a Book of Articles, which the clergy subscribed, for what else could they do, in which it was affirmed, "that a belief in the three an-

cient Creeds, the Apostles', the Nicene, the Athanasian, is necessary to salvation: that the Sacraments of Baptism, Penance and the Holy Eucharist are the ordinary means of salvation, and that the use of Masses, the honoring and invoking of Saints and the usual ceremonies of the public service, "are highly profitable, and ought to be retained." Shortly after, followed the "bloody six," inculcating "the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, the sufficiency of Communion under one kind, the celibacy of the clergy as obligatory by the Divine law, the binding force of vows of chastity, the lawfulness of low Masses, and the obligation of auricular confession." The punishment affixed to the rejection or violation of any one was fearful. Cranmer subscribed them (though it is said he had secretly married a wife) and helped to enforce them. Under the working of these "bloody six," Catholic as well as Protestant was made to suffer, the Catholics were hanged and quartered as traitors, the Protestants were burned as heretics. Under such a state of things, what could be expected from the people? When did popery ever do more? From this tyranny the realm was delivered, by the death of the king, the supreme head of Church and State, in 1547.

ACCESSION OF EDWARD VI.

Edward was in his 9th year when the affairs of Church and State were thrown upon him. Cranmer managed the spiritual, the Duke of Somerset, as Lord Protector, the temporal. Cranmer now developed his plan. Here it is. "He humbly petitioned the crown to be restored to the Episcopal jurisdiction, which, according to his favorite theory, had *wholly ceased* with the death of the late King; and most of the other bishops followed his obsequious example." Again: "In conformity with his well-known opinion and practice, the parliament solemnly declared that all jurisdiction, both spiritual and temporal, is derived *entirely from the King*, and hence, the election of bishops was withdrawn from the dean and chapters and vested wholly in the crown; and the bishops of course became mere state officials." Alas! for the succession. The mass of the people, however, were at

heart, not satisfied with this change, and could not be so easily estranged from the ancient faith. Says Hallam, *Con. His.*: "But the common people, especially in remote countries, had been used to an implicit reverence for the Holy See, and had suffered comparatively little by its impositions. They looked up also to their own teachers, as *guides in faith;* and the main body of the clergy were very reluctant to tear themselves, at the pleasure of a disappointed monarch, in the most dangerous crisis of religion, from the bosom of Catholic unity." Burnet "confesses that all endeavors were too weak to overcome the aversion of the people toward reformation, and even intimates that German troops were sent for from Calais, on account of the bigotry with which the bulk of the nation adhered to the old superstition. *This is a somewhat humiliating admission, that the Protestant faith was imposed upon our ancestors by a foreign army.*"

The same system of spoliation was continued under Edward VI, as under Henry VIII, and the affairs of the church regulated according to the pleasure of Cranmer and his assistants. Macaulay and Mackintosh, able men, in their *History of England and Miscellanies* say: "Here zeal was the tool of worldliness. A King whose character may be best described by saying, that he was despotism itself personified, unprincipled ministers, a rapacious aristocracy, a servile parliament. Such were the instruments by which England was delivered from the yoke of Rome. The work which had been begun by Henry, the murderer of his wives, was continued by Somerset, the murderer of his brother, and completed by Elizabeth, the murderer of her guest. Sprung from brutal passion, nurtured by selfish policy, the Reformation in England displayed little of what had in other countries distinguished it." . . . . The execution of More marks the moment of the transition of his government from joviality and parade to a species of atrocity which distinguishes it from, and perhaps above, any other European tyranny. . . He is the only prince of modern times, who carried judicial murder into his bed, and imbrued his hands in the blood of those whom he had caressed."

We have now a series of changes. After the accession of Mary, she attempted to undo what had been done and lead the realm back to Catholic unity.* The spirit of these rulers, actuating them, seems to have been the same. "The difference in this respect between the Catholics and Protestants was only in degree, and in degree there was much less difference than we are apt to believe. Persecution is *the deadly original sin of the reformed Churches;* that which cools every honest man's zeal for their cause, in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive." Hallam. The pointer now comes to the place on the dial, where the reckoning with these men took place, for the injury which had been done. Ridley and Latimer, refusing to recant, were burnt at the stake. Cranmer recanted seven times. "He acknowledged that he had been a greater persecutor of the church than Paul, and wished that, like Paul, he might be able to make amends. He could not rebuild what he had destroyed, but as the penitent thief on the cross, by the testimony of his lips, he might obtain mercy of the Almighty. He was unworthy of favor, and worthy not only of temporal, but eternal punishment. He had offended against King Henry and Queen Catharine; he was the cause and author of the divorce, and also of the evils which resulted from it. He had blasphemed against the Sacrament, had sinned against heaven, and had deprived men of the benefits to be derived from the Eucharist." —Strype. After having retracted so often, we are told that he had prepared a retraction of the former retractions, which he intended to read at the stake if not pardoned, and which he did read, after which he thrust his right hand into the fire, and,

---

* The history of the Reformation in England is full of strange problems. . . . During the twelve or thirteen years which followed the death of Henry VIII the religion of the Church was thrice changed. Protestantism was established by Edward: the Catholic Church was restored by Mary; Protestantism was again established by Elizabeth. The faith of the nation seemed to depend on the personal inclinations of the sovereign. Nor was this all. An established church was then, as a matter of course, a persecuting church. Edward persecuted Catholics, Mary persecuted Protestants, Elizabeth persecuted Catholics again. The father of these three sovereigns had enjoyed the pleasure of persecuting both these sects at once; and had sent to death on the same hurdle, the heretic who denied the real presence, and the traitor who denied the royal supremacy."—Macaulay, *Miss.*

as an *un*willing martyr, perished in the flames. We have a severe criticism passed on the character of this time-serving man, by Macaulay in his review of Hallam's *Con. His.*, fully sustaining what we have already said, the length of which forbids us to transcribe it. Bishop Short says of Mary: "Her foundations were made out of the revenues of the crown, and instead of making a gain of godliness, as was the general plan of the Reformation, she offered not unto the Lord of that which cost her nothing. Among other donations, she gave some rectories, which were in the hands of the crown, to Oxford, to repair the schools, and restored the temporalities to Durham, which had been taken away as a prey for the Duke of Northumberland."

ACCESSION OF ELIZABETH.

Under her reign we have the formal establishment by law, of what had been commenced by Henry and Edward. She ascended the throne in 1558. What her religious convictions really were, it is hard to determine. It is said, that she conformed to the Catholic faith, but her religious convictions, sincere or insincere, could not remain long concealed and, no doubt, she was led to gratify personal feeling and revenge. She well knew the position of the Roman See, in reference to the divorce of Queen Catharine, and that she was regarded as illegitimate, and illegally held the crown. Accordingly, she set about to abolish the Catholic religion in England, and to set up another, and then too, to rid herself of her Catholic rival, in the person of Mary, Queen of Scots: which she did by having her destroyed. Now firmly fixed on the throne, she determined on her policy, and gathered around her servants to carry it out. The principal man was Cecil, pardoned by Mary for having participated in the treason of Northumberland. Cecil became the chief in her council, and lent himself in wiping out every vestige of the old Church. In the first month of her reign, Cecil suggested, which she accepted, "to forbid all manner of sermons, that the preachers might not excite their hearers to resistance, to intimidate the clergy by prosecutions under the statute of præ-

munire and other penal laws, to debase, in the eyes of the people, all who had been in authority under the late queen, by rigorous inquiries into their conduct, and by bringing them, whenever it was possible under the lash of the law," &c. All this boded no good for the Church. In this fear the bishops were not disappointed, for soon some of them were seized, as was Bishop White of Winchester, and a royal proclamation appeared, forbidding the clergy to preach, and ordering the established worship to be observed "until consultation might be had in parliament by the queen and the three estates." "Oglethorpe, bishop of Carlisle, when about to celebrate Mass in the royal chapel on Christmas day, received an order not to elevate the Sacred Host in the queen's presence. He replied, with noble independence, "that his life was the queen's, but his conscience his own; on which Elizabeth, rising immediately after the Gospel, retired with her attendants." She was crowned by Oglethorpe, according to the entire service, she taking the oath in the usual form, which was solemnly sealed by the reception of the Holy Sacrament.*

In order to carry out her plan, she, with her managers, looked to parliament, and when that had been properly packed, the bill to abolish the old, and to establish the new order, passed the house of commons without much opposition, but in the other house only after a stormy debate. In the convocation of the clergy it experienced a most vigorous and unanimous, but fruitless opposition. This body presented to the house of lords a memorial "declaring their full and unshaken faith in all the articles of the Catholic faith," protesting "that to decide on doctrine, sacraments and discipline belonged, not to any lay assembly, but to the lawful pastors of the Church." But even these obstacles were overcome. Cecil, by some adroit manœuvering succeeded in silencing the most formidable part of this op-

---

* "Elizabeth did not refuse to take the ordinary oath to maintain the Catholic faith, and preserve the privileges and liberties of the church; . . . She allowed herself to be anointed, although with scorn and disdain; for when she had retired into her pavilion to take the royal habit, she said to her maids of honor: 'Don't approach me, that stinking oil would give you heartache.'"

position by arresting the bishops of Westminster and Lincoln, committing them to the tower, and binding over others, until judgment should be pronounced on them. With all those threats, and silencing of some of the opposition, "there were those that would not consent to violate their consciences by their vote. The additional bill in favor of the new book of common prayer, was adopted by the small majority of three, nine temporal and nine spiritual lords—including all the bishops who could be in attendance, voting against its passage." Her parliament was ready to do her bidding, by passing laws and hedging in the newly established order, and shows how completely all power had been vested in her, and "it might be delegated to any person or persons whatever, at the pleasure of the sovereign." The articles to be believed in were, in her reign, reduced to 39, instead of 42 as under Edward, and the "bloody six" under Henry. She was now firmly fixed, not only as Queen, but as head of the church. Whether the Roman Pontiff ever claimed more, and whether he ever showed greater tyranny, and whether his demands were not more in accordance with justice and right, than these of this newly constituted Popess is a question admitting of debate. But some of the bishops fought it "out on this line," even to the bitter end, by refusing to take the oath of Supremacy. They suffered deposition and imprisonment, all of which resulted in great injury to the church and the cause of Christ. Bishop Short says: "All the bishops, with the exception of one only, Kitchin of Llandaff, refused to do so (to take the oath of supremacy,) and were ejected from their sees, to the number of fourteen." The Archbishop of Canterbury died in July, 1558. Elizabeth, as head of the church, appointed Matthew Parker to fill the place. But how was he to be consecrated, seeing, that all, but one, of the Catholic bishops had been deposed? "The difficult case was referred by the council to six learned theologians and canonists, who decided that in such an emergency, the queen, as supreme head of the church, had authority to supply all deficiencies."*

* Sanders on the Anglican Reformation says, . . . "And thus as they were commonly reputed to be, destitute of *all lawful ordination*, and by the very laws of

Here comes in the question of Parker's consecration; a question that has been discussed by able men, who filled volumes, yet withal the question is still not clear, as may be seen from the above history, reciting how these singular scenes were being enacted. In reference to the consecrators, there is a mystery, for they were deprived of right under the last reign; besides, the fact, that the valid consecration of Barlowe, the principal consecrator, had been called in question. "Neither Archbishop Bramhall, with all his industry; nor Mason, with all his art; nor Burnet, with all his researches; nor Weston, with all his learning, could ever find out the useful documents." . . . "It is a wonderful thing," says Stephens, "by what chance or providence it happened that Barlowe's consecration, who was the principal actor in this, should nowhere appear, nor any positive proof of it be found in more than fourscore years since it was first questioned, by all the search that could be made by so many learned and industrious and curious persons."

Whatever may be said, for or against the argument in reference to the validity of his consecration, it must be admitted, from the plain facts of history as above recited, that the succession is not as clear and fully made out, as we are told by the Anglican Church. Who can read such a recital of historical facts, without having his mind disturbed with doubts in regard to this point? By the Episcopal church, ordination is denied to us; and yet, when we candidly investigate the fact, ordination in the German branch is, perhaps, as clear and as fully established as this in the English. Wherein do they differ? The English repudiated the Catholic church, and in turn was repudiated by the latter. So in Germany. The Reformers repudiated the Roman See, that repudiated them. Now, if the Anglican church had power, which she lawfully exercised, so did they claim on the Continent, where did the authority proceed

---

England were proved not to be bishops, they were obliged to implore the arm of the civil power, that they might obtain the sanction of the lay magistrate, in a subsequent parliament. By authority of which, whatever had been done irregularly, or unlawfully, or whatever had been omitted in their inauguration, might be pardoned them; this, after they had discharged the episcopal office and occupied sees some years, *without any episcopal consecration.* Hence they obtained the name of *Parliamentary Bishops.*

from? Bishops had been suspended; new ones made; where did this authority proceed from? Evidently, here both are on the same level; and there can be no doubt that the ordination in our branch is as valid as that of the Episcopal clergy, seeing the great confusion and doubt, especially in this case, and we cannot see how, under any circumstances, ordination could be repeated. The claim set up by them as the only consecrated ministry is untenable, in the face of such a history as that of Henry VIII and Queen Elizabeth, supreme heads of the church, the source of spiritual authority.

How Elizabeth accomplished the full establishment of her religion and the suppression of the old order, the after history clearly sets forth, which was done "by legal enactments; by subjecting dissenters to torture in every way, compelling them to become submissive and obedient to her will." This, space and time will fail us to notice. It is truly a sad history, and will not suffer, when placed side by side with the darkest page of papal persecution and torture. It is said that "during the last fourteen years of her reign, sixty-one clergymen, forty-seven laymen, and two gentlewomen suffered capital punishment for some or other of the spiritual felonies and treasons which had been lately created." During her entire reign, it is said "that one hundred and twenty-four clergymen suffered the cruel death of traitors, of whom one hundred and fourteen were secular priests, eight Jesuits, one Monk, and one Friar." Hallam tells us that the rack was used as a torture in her reign. "The rack seldom stood idle in the tower for all the latter part of Elizabeth's reign," &c. In reference to the number destroyed, Hallam confirms the statement above made. Yet in spite of these fierce and cruel persecutions against a people loyal to the crown, but who were unwilling to yield their consciences into the keeping of such a tyrant, the flame of religion, after the old order, was kept alive; as Hallam tells us, "Priests therefore traveled the country in various disguises, to keep alive the flame which the practice of outward conformity was likely to extinguish." . . . . "By stealth, at the dead of night, in private chambers, in the secret lurking place of an ill-peopled country, with all the mystery

that subdues the imagination, with all the mutual trust that invigorates constancy, these proscribed ecclesiastics celebrated their solemn rites more impressively in such concealment than if surrounded by all their former splendor." Hallam further says: "The statutes of Elizabeth's reign comprehend every one of these progressive degreees of restraint and persecution. . . . . The necessity, I am persuaded, can never be made out; the statutes were, in many instances, absolutely unjust; in others, not demanded by circumstances; in almost all prompted by religious bigotry, by excessive apprehension, or by the arbitrary spirit with which our Government was administered under Elizabeth." Bishop Short says, "The ravage which was committed by Henry was the wasteful prodigality of a tyrant." . . "Under Edward, the monarch was too weak to resist the avarice of those who governed, and Mary rather enriched than robbed the establishment; but Elizabeth laid her hands on all she could grasp, though, for the sake of keeping up appearances, she restored some small portion in foundations connected with education. The poverty of the church, in the early part of the reign of Elizabeth, was excessive; not only among the higher clergy, who were exposed to these attacks from the court, but among the lower and laborious individuals, who possess no dignified station, and have no further worldly prospect than to provide bread for themselves and their families." In reference to the persecutions under Elizabeth, Agnes Strickland says: . . . "That the unsparing use of the rack, the gibbet, and the quartering knife failed either to silence the zeal of the Puritans, or to deter the seminary priests from performing their perilous missions as teachers of their proscribed doctrines." Macaulay says: "Non-conformity was severely punished. The Queen prescribed the exact rule of religious faith and discipline, and whoever departed from that rule, either to the right or to the left, was in danger of severe punishment." In reference to her end, Agnes Strickland says: "It is almost a fearful task to trace the passage of the mighty Elizabeth through the dark valley of the shadow of death. Many have been dazzled with the splendor of her life, but few, even of her

most ardent admirers, would wish their last end might be like her's." "The Queen kept her bed fifteen days," continues Lady Southwell, "besides the three days she sat upon a stool; and one day while being pulled up by force, she obstinately stood on her feet for fifteen hours. When she was near her end the council sent to her the Archbishop of Canterbury, and other prelates, at the sight of whom she was much offended, cholericly rating them, bidding them 'be packing,' saying 'she was no atheist, but she knew full well they were but hedge priests.'"

Such is a sketch of this wonderful movement, in the sixteenth century, in England, as presented by historians, who endeavor to give history as it transpired, and not to support a particular theory whether of Church or State. It may not be uninteresting to look it full in the face, in all its extent, to see what it involves, when dissatisfied with our Church relations, and we become desirous of changing them. To do this fully and frankly, to admit the true force of history, which of right belongs to this movement, as well as that in Germany, of which our partial historians say nothing, but carefully give only the bright side of the picture, would enable us to go far, in the solution of the great problem of Protestantism which is to be solved. If we could only be candid enough, to admit for the sake of truth, that there were gross defects in the men who led these movements in the sixteenth century, and acknowledge their inconsistencies, while we look equally in earnest at those of the Papacy, discarding them on both sides, and accepting that which is true and right, no matter where found, we would, no doubt, be prepared to reach a higher stadium and come nearer

---

Note. The aim of the foregoing article is merely to bring to view the human agents, and their work in this movement, without any attempt to trace the divine guidance, overruling all. We have been led, to a great extent, to regard the actors in the movements of the sixteenth century, as entirely free from fault, and their work above criticism, engendering the spirit of pride, and "becoming vainly puffed up." In the conflict now before us, it is proper and right that we should know and understand, what these antecedents are. Of the character of the Popes and their Legates it was not the aim of the writer to speak, neither has he any apology to make for them, but in candor and charity, gives them credit, where, in his judgment, it is deserved. The authorities cited in the article, are those known to every reader of history.

to the "Church of the Future," where, "they all shall be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us."

Art. III.—THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BY REV. PROF. THEODORE APPEL, LANCASTER, PA.

Die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verfassung. Ein geschichtlicher versuch von Richard Rothe. Wittenberg, 1837.

History of the Apostolic Church with a general Introduction to Church History, by Philip Schaff. New York: Scribner, 1853.

Christianity and the Christian Church are closely and vitally connected together, so much so that the one could not be said to exist without the other. The latter is something more than a merely human contrivance, designed to protect those who are in it from the attacks of Satan, as the walls of a city defend its inhabitants from besieging hosts. It is the embodiment of all the living forces included in the former, the home of the Holy Ghost, through whom the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ in all its power is revealed to men and brought to bear upon the world at large. According to St. Paul, the relation between the two is the same as that of the soul to the body, and, therefore, he calls the Church the Body of Christ. If this is not merely oriental imagery, which may God ever protect us from believing, it means that, whilst they are different, they are nevertheless one and inseparable, necessarily united, once and forever. As the body without the soul is a corpse, and as the soul without the body is an abstraction or a ghost, so the actual existence of Christianity in the world, requires the necessary existence of the Church as its counterpart. The one is the inside, the other, the outside of the same living process.

In consequence of this connection, it follows that in order to understand the nature, constitution, rise, progress, or history of the Church, it is necessary, that we should have a correct and adequate idea of Christianity, its informing power. Apart from this, we must see the whole process in a wrong light, and must be continually at the mercy of our unreal, subjective fancies. This is so evident, that facts or proofs to support it seem to be superfluous. Every religious sect down to those, which scarcely deserve to be called any longer Christian, has its own view of the Church, of early Christianity, and of Church history, in which it differs from all its neighbors higher or lower in their Christian character, upon which it builds and for which it is ready to stand or fall. The Christianity of the early ages, so far as it was pure and uncorrupted, it supposes, was the same as its own, nothing higher, deeper, nor wider. In the nature of the case, therefore, where so many and such contradictory views prevail in regard to the same fact, there must be a vast amount of pure subjectivity, of errors numerous enough to fill more than one of Lord Bacon's dens for such kinds of idols.

Fortunately our modern evangelical Theology, in the proper sense of the term, has turned attention away from matters comparatively non-essential, to the consideration of the peculiar essential character of Christianity itself. Schleiermacher in Germany more than any one else, deserves the credit for giving this direction to the religious thinking of our age. At a time of self-inflated illuminism, when in his own country at least, it was supposed that Christianity had outlived itself, he it was who showed to the superficial thinkers of his day, that Christianity included in itself much more than what they had ever thought of before, something vastly more enduring than dogmas, confessions, or outward forms. He started this fundamental inquiry, without, however, fully satisfying it. In the hands of others, it has been prolific of much good fruit; so that in our day, the science, as it may be called, of Christianity is no doubt better understood than in any of the ages that are past; simply because never before was so much of earnest and enduring attention paid to it. In the columns of this periodical, the sub-

ject has come up frequently, and been discussed earnestly from various points of view, not without rendering important help, as we think, in the solution of the general question.

Taking it for granted that the latest results in the progress of Theology, in Germany, England, and to some extent also in this country, have supplied us with a more correct theoretical view of Christianity, we shall employ it in this article to show how the outward historical Church took its rise, assumed form and shape, and became a central fact in the world's history. In doing so it will be necessary, we are aware, to repeat much that has been said already in these pages; but the unity of our theme requires it, and it is a desideratum that the two most important and comprehensive facts in history, Christianity and the Church, should be held up at the present time in their vital relation to each other. In this light they are always presented to our view in the Word of God, but not always in our preaching and theological literature. The consequence of such violent putting asunder of what God has joined together, is that both are deprived of their real, positive, and vital character.

Christianity, as a system of redemption, as a fundamental fact brought to pass by the God-man, is something fundamental to the human race, much more so than any other, lying back, as it were, of all our particular human activities, but so related to them throughout, as to touch them at every point. The most general conception which we can form of it is that of a vast and comprehensive *power* or *force* in the human world, in many respects analogous to the force of gravitation in the natural. It is, however, raised infinitely above the forces of the physical creation, inasmuch as it has to do with living human beings, complex in their structure; and endowed with the principle of freedom and personality, a ruling principle adapted to the necessities of such a case must be something much higher and more refined than the simple forces of attraction or repulsion which rule in the material world. it must have all the characteristics of *life* itself, as broad as the race and commensurate with its necessities and wants. Hence the fact of redemption in the Scriptures is always referred back to a new spiritual life intro-

duced into the world by the advent of Jesus Christ. So numerous are the passages in the Bible, both in the gospels and epistles, that time would fail us, if we should refer to them here in detail. They will occur to the reader spontaneously in all their variety, from those that refer to the new birth and the living vine, onward to the passage in which Christians are said to be living stones in the temple of God. In this last instance, where dead, inorganic matter, stones, are used for the purpose of illustration, the figure is felt to be inadequate; and the apostle, in order that the living power residing in believers, which was always uppermost in his mind, might not be overlooked, calls them *living* stones, in violation of the rules of rhetoric, on the principle that the higher law must rule the lower.

The new life, however, thus introduced into history, in order that it might accomplish the object in view, could not be of a character extraneous to man: it must be purely and distinctly *human*. Otherwise it could find no point of connection, no maternal source in the bosom of humanity. We may conceive of higher or lower orders of life, as we see in nature, where they exist independently of each other, without the possibility of the one taking the place of the other. In the case of animals of different species, where a union of life takes place to any extent, the result is a monstrosity. So the new life infused into our common humanity, could not come to us from pure beings of other spheres, not from angelic beings, nor from any other kind. In order that it may be strictly human, so as to meet the demands of the case, it must come from man himself. All this is involved in the proposition of the Apostle, where he says, For as by man came death, by man came also the resurrection from the dead (1 Cor. xv. 21).

But how shall this be accomplished? How shall man, who is said to be dead, be the source of life to himself? This Scriptural paradox is answered and the difficulty removed, by the mysterious union of the human and divine natures in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, whereby our frail human nature was taken up and purified by its union with the divine, so as to become a fountain of life and immortality to the world

dead in trespasses and sins. As God never works magically nor mechanically in the human world, but always in harmony with the laws of the constitution of man, so it was in this particular case. He might have operated upon him much as galvanism acts upon a corpse, producing spasmodic motion, but not the glow of life and health. We know that He did not do so. He saw in man something more than single individuals or transient phenomena; He had given him a generic nature, something different from individuality or personality, and yet always connected with it as its life or deepest ground. The term *humanity* is a fact, an actual existence in our world, an entity, not a mere abstraction. So it is regarded in the Bible, and in the confessions of the Christian Church generally. It is this that constitutes the unity of the race, as well as its diversity; it is also the source which determines the character and destiny of men generally for weal or for woe. It is a distinction not often made in works which treat of the nature and constitution of man, but one which must stand out in prominent relief in every true system of Theology, notwithstanding the boasted triumphs of the nominalist over the realist in the schools of philosophy. It was the actual medium through which sin and death have been propagated from our first parents down through successive ages by natural descent. Without it, it would be absurd to suppose that sin descends at all from parents to their children. Besides, it is philosophically false to conceive of individuals as having any independent existence whatever, apart from the species or genus to which they belong.

Now when God proposed to redeem our race and to restore to it its lost life, He had regard to this fact in our primitive, original constitution. His system of gracious influences commenced with the root of the evil, not at its effects or outward manifestations. As humanity, our generic life, was corrupt and diseased, He proceeded first to heal it, and so to restore it to its healthy, normal condition. This, as we have said, He accomplished by the Incarnation, in which Christ, the Son of God took upon Himself our flesh or nature, and so became bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh. He did not unite Himself to

any individual man, as this would have rendered Him a double being, consisting of two distinct persons, a dualism, which idea the Church has always rejected. It was sufficient, and no doubt the only possible course of procedure in the circumstances, that He should unite himself to our humanity, which He received from the Virgin Mary by the operation of the Holy Ghost, purify and sanctify it by an organic union with His own heavenly, divine nature and personality, and thus constitute in Himself a new fountain of humanity, from which the race should take a new start, and its history should flow forth in multitudinous streams of blessings to the world at large. He found our poor, prostrate human nature a putrid stream, a stagnant, noxious pool, sending forth poisonous, pestilential effluvia, the resort of doleful creatures, noxious reptiles, and foul birds of prey. But when he brought it to confront His heavenly presence, a process of attraction or evaporation, so to speak, commenced; every thing purely human ascended, leaving all its impurities behind, and, distilled through the alembic of the skies, it descended again in fructifying showers of pure, living waters, to refresh the parched soil of our famine-stricken earth.

In entire harmony with this view of the case, is the remarkable fact, that our Saviour in all His words and works refers His hearers continually to Himself, to His own person, as the source of salvation and eternal life. When He told the multitude, not to labor for the bread that perisheth, but for that bread that endureth unto eternal life, which the Son of Man should give them, they in accordance with their Jewish way of thinking, thought that He intended to prescribe for them an external work or legalistic observance, and inquired what they were to do that they might work the works of God. To correct this inveterate tendency to depend on outward works, and to arouse their sluggish minds, He calls away their thoughts from everything of an external character, and fixes their attention upon Himself. This is the work of God, He told them, that ye believe on Him whom the Father hath sent (John vi. 29). They already believed in God, but it was all important that they should believe in Him also. This was what He intended to effect

by the miracle of the loaves and the fishes on the previous day. They believed that God, the Father, gave them their daily bread, but it was also necessary that they should believe that it came to them through God, the Son. This they could be brought to see and feel only by such a miracle as the one just referred to. But having proved to them that they were dependent on Him, no less than their heavenly Father for their temporal subsistence, He proceeds to teach them, that He was also the source of a still higher, a spiritual or eternal life to their souls. He had spoken to them of the bread that endureth unto eternal life, not like the manna, which their fathers had eaten in the wilderness; and now to prevent them from supposing that the bread they had eaten the day before, His doctrine, His works, or anything else outside of Himself, was the bread of life, He brings them back once more to His own person, and assures them that *He Himself* was that bread of life, literally and without a figure, the bread of life. The bread of God, He says, is He which cometh down from heaven. These words made a deep impression on the minds of His simple-minded hearers, strengthened, no doubt, by the deep earnestness of the Saviour's countenance and voice. They are silent, and ask no more quibbling questions. The darkness, which had hitherto enshrouded their minds began to vanish, and light from the eternal world, to break through the intervening clouds of ignorance and prejudice. Faith in the God-man, trembles on the horizon of their souls, and they exclaim: Lord, evermore give us this bread to eat. Their prayer was, to be in communication with such a fountain of life continually and for all time, as a source of good, compared with which all other forms of good were of comparatively small account.

The Saviour then goes on, in the remainder of His discourse, to confirm the good impression, which had just been made, to show to the people, that He was the source of life and immortality, and that He was the true bread of life, which could satisfy the wants of fallen humanity and impart to it life, health, and vigor. He does not, however, concern Himself to make the matter clearer, or more intelligible to their natural understand-

ing. Rather, He increases their difficulty by the use of hard words, of strange and extraordinary language, such as had never been heard of before. In the further unfolding of the subject, He says, Except ye eat the flesh of the *Son of Man*, and drink His blood; ye have no life in you. As the living Father hath sent me and I live by the Father, so He that *eateth Me*, even he shall live by Me. Such language no other human being had ever used before, or even thought of using. Had it been employed in the palmy days of Greece in the Academy, in the Lyceum, or on the Porch, it would have met with a storm of hisses from the scholars of that day, and been regarded most probably as the ravings of a madman. Philosophers generally have been wont to make no account of their person in their instructions; they have preferred to conceal themselves behind their systems, and have always referred to their doctrines or books, as the medicine which they had come to prescribe for the souls of their fellow-men. Mohammed, who wished to pursue a career equal or superior to that of Jesus of Nazareth, did not claim for himself any healing powers; whatever he did or said, he professed had come from the one God, of whom he was only the prophet or organ. The difference here noticed can be explained only on the supposition, that Christ regarded Himself as occupying a relation to our race, which no other human being could occupy, and that the extraordinary language, which He uses in this 6th chapter of St. John, was intended to express a truth, which had never before entered the thoughts, much less the language of men. At the close of His discourse, He explains Himself, but only in order to prevent a gross misconception of His meaning. By His flesh and blood, he did not wish them to understand so many particles of matter, so much fibre, so many globules of blood. These in themselves could not constitute either flesh or blood. It was the living power behind them, so to speak, which organized so many particles, that constituted them flesh and blood. To eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, means, therefore, a living union with Him, a participation of His *divine-human life*, a union with that pure humanity, which He had gathered up and sanctified in His own person, with the view of imparting it to the world at large.

We are aware that it is a common impression that the Saviour here, as well as elsewhere, when speaking of His mystical union with believers, employs only strongly figurative language, and that all attempt to make more out of it, is simply mysticism. There is we grant, a mystery here, an awful and stupendous mystery, but that does not destroy its character as a fact and a truth of the most enduring importance. During the sixteenth century, so precious and so far reaching was the doctrine of the Saviour's flesh regarded, that it threw the Christian world into a commotion, which continued for many years; because it was supposed that it was in danger of being rejected. Many thanks to brave old Luther, whose faith and pertinacity, preserved it as a precious inheritance for one part of the Protestant Church, and to John Calvin, who with equal faith and a sterner logic, achieved a like result for the other part.

But is there no danger of carrying the analogy too far? It is intimated, especially by persons in this country, that this whole method of representation is pantheistic, if not gross pantheism itself. We apprehend that such persons have no adequate idea of the great truth that lies at the foundation of pantheism, and of course, are not in a condition, to see that it is the Incarnation, with its divine-human Mediator, uniting heaven and earth, man and God, which cuts up all pantheism by its roots, deprives it of all occupation in the sphere of abstract thinking, and conserves the great truth, which has given it such a potent charm to the great thinkers of all ages of the world. In the "incarnate mystery," we in the simplicity of our faith, see not the danger, but the cure of Pantheism, Buddhism, and all other great errors of the heathen world. At the same time, we are free to confess, and most firmly do we maintain, that whilst the glorified humanity of Christ in its action upon men, does not deify them, it does nevertheless elevate them almost infinitely above the plane of their natural, unregenerate state. It accomplishes for them something more than deliverance from death, or restoration to moral purity. By and through their sanctification, it invests them with powers and prerogatives, such as had never entered the natural understanding to conceive

of; it enables them to tread on serpents, and gives them power over the adversary; it makes them kings and priests unto God, and restores to man the sovereignty over the natural world, which he lost by the fall. All this is exemplified in the life of our Saviour. As the Son of God, He could receive nothing, for he possessed all things by an eternal inheritance; but as the Son of Man He must receive every thing. As the Son of Man, He received the power, with which He performed miracles, walked on the sea, and raised the dead; so from Him as the Son of Man, believers receive power to do the same works, and, as He says, even greater works. Hence the multitude glorified God, who had given such power to *men*. Matt. ix. 8. Man may be elevated, as we know he is by the presence of the Holy Ghost in humanity, without any danger of our thinking for a moment that he is in any sense deified. Not only so, but as believers in Christ, the Son of Man, we are bound to believe, that man is to be immensely exalted by Christianity, and invested with powers and prerogatives over nature and the world of darkness, that will constitute him really and truly the sovereign under God in the sphere in which he lives; such as he would have been, had not sin separated him from union with the eternal Logos. This, we conceive, is the great truth, which lies at the foundation of the doctrine of the *Communicatio Idiomatum* of the Lutheran Church. Such a doctrine, we may be assured, could not have been elaborated with so much care by so many and such distinguished divines, unless it had some substantial Christian basis for its foundation.

This divine-human life, proceeding from the Saviour, and entering into history as the most comprehensive of all other powers, must, we now remark, have all the characteristics of a real and true life. It must be *organic*, not of course in a physical or a materialistic sense. Life may be in the highest degree spiritual, and yet organic and generic in its processes; to be life at all, it must tend continually towards an organization commensurate with its character. As something inward it can in fact have no existence whatever, except as it has become also outward; nor can it remain in a healthy and vigorous state, except as it has free course thus to become objective to itself.

Christianity, indeed, as the deepest and most comprehensive life of the world, compared with which all other forms of life are only typical, phenomenal and transitory, ought, and as we shall try to show, does show this tendency towards organization everywhere and always in the highest degree. As a new determining power for humanity at large, once entering in an actual way into the history of the world, it must have an historical development, and must appear under the form under which humanity unfolds itself generally, that is, it must take up the social principle, and appear necessarily under the form of society, a religious community pervaded by a common life. This is true of every form of religious life, but much more must this be the case with Christianity, which is the absolute form of human life, intended to bring it to a full consciousness of itself and to a full development of all its hidden possibilities.

Originally this life of Christ is hidden in the soul of believers, and is mainly internal, showing itself in a new form of self-consciousness or feeling, a Christ-consciousness, and then under the forms of thought and will. But it cannot continue to exist as something purely internal or subjective. There exists within it, as in all other kinds of life, an immanent necessity or impulse to externalize itself, and so to create for itself also a real outward existence. Its very vitality depends on this autonomic power, and its intensity on the freedom with which this impulse or tendency is allowed to act. The one simply strengthens and confirms the other. A purely subjective religion is either in a diseased state, or if healthy, but prevented from externalizing itself in some outward and appropriate form, it must become diseased, and die out like fire in the absence of enkindling fuel.

This outward form, as we have said, is conditioned by the social principle, which rules universally in the general life of humanity, and becomes the Christian Church, the only form in which the divine-human life of the Redeemer appears in history. The internal feeling of communion, awakened in believers by union with Christ through the Holy Ghost, can be satisfied only by an external communion, in which it shall be kept up and have free course to unfold itself. This must be of a character

to correspond with its own peculiar nature, and extend just as far as it is generic and human. But as the life of Christ is humanity itself, elevated and sanctified by the human with the godhead in His person, as already said, it follows that Christianity must penetrate the whole race, like leaven, reorganize it, and give it a new form, answerable to its own general or universal character. Nothing short of this will meet the demands of the case. Whilst in unregenerated humanity the world over, there is a deep longing for redemption, for unity, harmony, and peace among all men, much more is this the case in that renewed form of humanity that shows itself in all true Christians. There has been a loud and earnest call, proceeding from the Christian consciousness of all ages, for unity, universality, and catholicity in the communion of saints. At the present day, when Christendom is divided, it shows itself often spontaneously; and often also in the collisions, bickerings, and controversies of different religious denominations; for did not each possess in itself the feeling of catholicity as its end, there could be no room for jealousy; each might be content to occupy its own territory in peace with its neighbors, as was the case with the religions of antiquity. But, as history goes to show, stronger perhaps than ever since was this feeling among believers in the beginning. It was inherent in the new life and spirit that moved upon the face of the general mind of the Church. The communion that was forming, the family of God that was gathered together, the Church that was to be built up, must exhibit the attributes of *unity* and *catholicity*. This was a postulate.

Rothe after showing the necessity of the Church, as the outward form of the living power of Christianity, starts an inquiry in regard to the particular form it is destined to assume in the end, and, after an elaborate analysis of the idea both of the Church and State, arrives at the startling conclusion, that the State must eventually absorb the Church and render its continued existence unnecessary. Thus far, and it may be for ages to come, the Church has been a necessity, because the State has not been sufficiently pervaded by the spirit of Christianity; but when that is once the case, far in the future, as he and most

other persons would suppose, the Church, which has been a beneficial though temporary arrangement, will pass away, and the State will take out of its hands its heavenly functions, such as government, teaching, education, doctrine, worship, and culture. He professes to arrive at this conclusion, by an independent process of reasoning on the idea and design of the State, which is highly refreshing as compared with the low, materialistic views, so generally prevalent; but his conclusions are revolting to the Christian consciousness, and they met with the stern rebuke of the best men of Germany at the time they were published. That would be just as bad as the absorption of the State by the Church, as it was attempted at times during the middle ages. It would be negative Protestantism carried out to its legitimate result. He thinks that in this way he furnishes the best vindication of the Reformation, as well as a palliation for the subsequent eclipse which the idea of one holy, catholic church has since undergone, and comforts himself with the thought that the present confusion and division in Protestantism are necessary to prepare the way for a new order of things, when the State shall be regenerated, and subserve the interests of piety and religion more faithfully than it has been in the power of the Church to do. Most probably, unconsciously to himself, Rothe was influenced by the status of the Church around him, which has been in Germany more or less one of servitude to the State ever since the Reformation. If the State there controls education and cultus, why may it not go farther and assume to itself all the other prerogatives of the Church? Let it be granted, that the union of Church and State, as it exists in Europe, is in all respects in harmony with the Christian idea, and we do not see why Rothe's speculation should not be received as true, or, rather we might say, as a rigidly logical conclusion. If our surmise should be correct in regard to Rothe, it would follow that this same night-mare on the breast of the German Evangelical Church may have a paralyzing effect upon other distinguished German divines when they come to discuss the church-question.

With an equally keen analysis, but with much more force of

truth, Rothe disposes of the old Protestant distinction of a visible and invisible church, and shows that an invisible church is a contradiction of terms, a mere abstraction or fiction, in which Protestants, not without a basis of truth, took refuge, when hard pressed by their adversaries of the Church of Rome. In this he simply anticipates the conclusion at which Protestant theology most probably will arrive by and by. The distinction of an invisible church seems to be no longer of any use, and Protestantism has secured for itself other and better weapons of defence. The Church has an inner side, but it is always, whether Protestant or Catholic, visible.

In regard to the particular form, under which the Church should appear in history, neither Christ nor the Apostles have given us any definite information. It was not necessary that they should; it would no doubt have been deleterious and destructive to the work of redemption, had they done so. Had any definite form been prescribed that would have been in all respects adapted to the early ages of the Church, it might not have suited succeeding ages, when the circumstances were different and the free development of the Christian principle required other and different forms. Then would have followed petrifaction, stagnation, and death, the end of all systems of natural religion, which are the product of certain ages or eras. For a while they flourish, embody themselves in certain fixed institutions, and then die for the want of an innate power to continue the process of development. Christianity was not something local, nor was it designed for any particular age or century exclusively. It carried within it a new life for humanity at large, and could not be fully embodied by any age, race, or nationality. In this respect it differs from Judaism, which came from God through Moses as a perfect system of forms and ceremonies, carried out to the minutest detail, intended for the Jews and for the Jews only. There was as yet no divine human life for the world at large, merely forms, types, and shadows, that pointed like so many finger-boards to the new dispensation of life that was to arise in the future. Here minutiæ and detail were necessary, and essential; but when

Christianity, the new life of the world, came to light, it was in itself sufficient to provide for the details of its development subsequently. In Judaism the basis was the letter, pointing to the spirit; in Christianity the basis was the spirit, giving life to the letter. Christianity must, therefore, be first established in the world, so as to have a connecting link with history: then believers under the guidance of the Holy Ghost would be prepared to build up the Church in detail in harmony with its inward spirit. Accordingly, this was the main work of the Saviour and the apostles, whilst they were on earth, the laying of a suitable foundation for the great work that was to follow.

It must not, however, be supposed that they were indifferent to the regular establishment and organization of the Church in after times. They looked forward towards it as part and parcel of the work in which they were themselves engaged. Our Saviour, speaking of the Church at large says: Upon this rock, I will build My church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. He then gives Peter and the rest of the disciples power to act in the case; invests them with the power of the keys, of opening and closing the kingdom of heaven against men; and supplies them with all the means that were necessary to carry out the work. It could not be said that He founded His Church whilst He was on earth, but, as we shall see further on He fully prepared the way for its rise and progress. The disciples generally were filled with bright expectations of it as something that would soon come to pass. Just before the Saviour ascended up on high, they asked the question, whether He would at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel. Their original conception of the Church, of course, was worldly, Judaistic, dim, and very inadequately defined. Images of worldly power and glory floated before their minds, and to them probably nothing more than the restoration of the old Jewish theocracy was the ultimate form which Christianity was to assume. But the words of the Saviour afterwards recurring to them, as well as the course of events in the progress of the truth, shook these gross conceptions, and prepared the way gradually for more rational and intelligent views of the subject. In no one

did the idea of the Church work so powerfully as in the apostle Paul. His success in building up independent congregations on heathen ground, enlarged his views of Christianity in its relations to the world, separated him from the theocratic views of the Jews, and showed him the necessity of an organization that should take up the Gentile as well as the Jewish world. Occupying a peculiarly Christian point of view, free from Judaizing tendencies and sympathies, the idea of the Church took strong hold of him; and it fell to his lot to work out this extremely difficult problem, for which, by his fervent, hopeful spirit, and clear Christian consciousness, he was also best adapted. "He did not arrive at this result," says Rothe, "in a way which would appear to us the most direct and easy. He does not, for instance, commence constructing his idea of the Christian Church with the thought of that internal, spiritual communion of Christians as such, as distinguished from that which is external, although the difference between the internal and external side of Christian communion was by no means absent from his mind (Rom. xiv. 17). So too, in general, he did not derive it from any kind of reflection upon the communion of Christians with one another, but from the *consciousness of their relation to Christ.* From this directly arose his consciousness of their relation to each other." P. 287.

The relation of believers to the Saviour was for the apostle a matter of conscious experience, a real vital union. As he could not think of Christ except as living, and therefore active, this living union appeared to him as a state of absolute dependence, an interpenetration of the soul of the one with that of the other: the Saviour as the animating principle, the believer the organ of His activity, of His redeeming function. Here in Him he found the source of all communion among His disciples; they stood in the same relation to Him, were animated by the same Christ, and were all His members or organs. With this homogeneity of life, they were organically bound together in their vital activities by a principle, which continually referred them back to the source of their unity. Thus together they constituted a single organism, in which they were all members of Christ. Their indi-

vidual differences or peculiarities, so far from interfering with their union with each other, became mutual points of attraction, which as a diversity of gifts with the same Spirit, tended to organize them more closely into a living unity. In this sense the totality of believers became the body of Christ, of which He is the head, they, the members. "What Paul here calls the body of Christ," says Rothe, "is the complex of believers, something in itself living and pervaded with the quickening Spirit of Christ, in that proportion in which it is the organ, through which He works in the world, so that believers are to Him what the body is to the soul, the organ by means of which He is active." The apostle gives expression to the same conception of the Church, in substance, by means of another image, the temple or house of God. This was not peculiar to him, but was familiar to the Jewish mind, and was also used by St. Peter. This image is perhaps not so expressive as the other; it teaches, that the Church is that peculiar form of humanity, in which God Himself is pleased to dwell; but, in the hand of St. Peter, it is so marshalled into service, as to be made to express fully his sense of the new life of believers under the conception of lively or living stones. "Here in both figures," says Rothe again, "we meet directly with the true salient point in the conception of the Christian Church; with precisely that moment in its evolution, which afterwards constituted the living, genuine germ of the Catholic Church, namely with the thought that in a definite human society or community, redemption became in a real way an historical potence, and that in it alone the Redeemer acquired and still retains an historical existence and an historical activity; or in the striking language of Möhler, that in a definite human society, and in that alone, the Word-made-flesh continues itself and the fact of the Incarnation constantly perpetuates itself."* P. 288, 289, 290.

* The reader will not fail to observe the substantial agreement of the thoughts here expressed, and those contained in Dr. Nevin's masterly exposition of the idea of the Church in his reply to Dr. Dorner, in a previous number. Dr. D. would hardly say, we presume, that Dr. Nevin's views of the Church find no point of connection at all with German theology, which as we understand, he does not do, although he repudiates them so far as his own is concerned.

Now if the idea of the Church grew out of the general, Christian life of believers, or as Rothe expresses it, "out of the consciousness of their relation to Christ," we are prepared to see how the Church took its rise and developed itself in the course of history. In the first place, it was necessary that the requisite power should be at hand, such as we have found already in the divine-human life of our Saviour; and in the next place, the means to make it available and to perpetuate it in the world. The latter, as we have said, Christ Himself prepared before He ascended up on high. These were few and simple. First of all it was necessary, that there should be some distinct act, by which men should be introduced into this new order of life, and made constituent elements of this new organization or society, and be identified as such as well as distinguished from the world on the outside. Hence *Baptism* was instituted. As individual men are introduced into the present, sinful order of human life by natural birth or descent, so they must needs be introduced into the kingdom of heaven by a new, spiritual birth, by baptism, a being born of water and the Spirit. To unfold this new life, to confirm, strengthen, and perpetuate it, another act was necessary; hence the institution of the *Lord's Supper*, in which the new-born have an opportunity to eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man, and so be made forevermore partakers of His theanthropic life. To perform these acts, to guide and direct the Church in its formation and subsequent progress, to speak the words of God, the gospel life, as He would have it spoken, and to hold up to view the power of the new life in their own persons, an order of men had to be appointed: hence the *Christian Ministry* was established. They were prepared for this work by the Saviour Himself during His life-time, endowed subsequently with all the graces necessary for their work by the gift of the Spirit, and officially invested with authority to guide and direct the Church by the power of the keys. Such were the simple conditions by which Christ prepared the way for the building up of His kingdom on earth. As in the human body, and in the more complicated organisms generally, there are certain vital parts, centres of distinct systems,

harmoniously blended in one general system, such as the heart, the lungs, or the brain, so it must be in that more complicated organism of the Church. Here too there must also be vital points, centres of life and power, and these are found in the Ministry, the Word, and the Sacrament.

According to Rothe the church could not properly be said to take its rise until congregations had been organized in different places, which afterwards having been brought into outward as well as inward union, constituted the Church in the proper sense of the term. In this, however, he is corrected, and we think very properly, by Dr. Schaff, who very justly puts the Church first and the congregation second. "The whole system of Government," he says, "formed itself from above downward, from the general to the particle and not the contrary." Further, Dr. Schaff also considers the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost as the "birth of the Church," as the proper date of its origin. "It was the generative beginning of a vast series of workings and manifestations of God in history; the fountain of a river of life, which flows with unbroken current, through all time, till it merge in eternity." The Holy Ghost, who was the bond of union between Father and Son in the godhead from all eternity; who moved upon the face of the waters in the beginning, and inspired holy men of old from time to time as occasion required; who overshadowed the Virgin Mary, and became the bond of union connecting the human and divine natures in Christ; who descended upon Christ at His baptism in Jordan and abode with Him ever afterwards; this same Holy Ghost, who had not yet been revealed, because Christ had not been glorified, took up His permanent abode among believers, on the day of Pentecost, and became the bond of a living union between them and their Head forever afterwards. This event, therefore, may be properly called the birth-day of the Church, the era of its foundation, and the beginning of that stream of grace, which up to this point had been confined to the person of the Redeemer; but which now by this agency of the Spirit, was opened and poured out in multitudinous streams of blessings upon the world. It is true the Church

as thus constituted was not fully or completely organized, as it was afterwards. It might be said to have been simple and rudimental in its form; still it was the Church truly organized, and embodying in itself all the powers and possibilities of the widest, the grandest, and the most permanent organization, which the world has ever witnessed. It may be said to have never as yet been fully organized; it cannot be said to be, certainly at the present day, amidst the divisions and dissensions among Christians, which so sadly mar her unity and beauty.

On the day of Pentecost, the disciples were filled with the Holy Ghost to overflowing; they were united into one body, and made to stand out as something distinct from the mass of humanity around them. They were in common partakers of the same divine gifts, and stood in co-ordinate relation to their common Head; but it must not be supposed that there was in all respects a dead level of equality, that excluded all distinctions and differences. There was from the start a difference between those who were leaders and those who followed; between the apostles, and the people. This distinction was acknowledged not as something based on the superior knowledge or personal worth of the apostles, but on the divine appointment and the necessities of the case. There can be no organization among men without this distinction between those who lead or rule and those who are led. So it is in the state, where the ruler or magistrate comes uppermost by an inevitable necessity in all places and in all conditions of society; where it is repressed, it breaks out and authenticates itself in the monstrosity of lynch-law. The same necessity existed at the formation of the Church, and it has asserted itself ever since. The apostles, representing all the functions of the ministerial office, were clothed with authority by Christ Himself to rule and direct the affairs of the Church in accordance with His will, and the believers generally accorded to them this authority and pre-eminence, cheerfully as a matter of course. They were next to Christ a necessary and essential centre of unity alike for individuals and bodies of individuals, or congregations. They did not go before the Church, on the one hand, and like mechanics,

proceed to construct the new building, nor on the other hand, did they follow as the creatures of the Church, clothed by it with authority. They constituted next to Christ the first stone or foundation, upon which the whole superstructure was to rest (Eph. ii. 20), the central wave in this renewed form of humanity, around which the whole human family is destined to gather in concentric circles, ever widening until the pentecostal gift shall have reached the utmost limits of the race. Some quotations here from Dr. Schaff's great work on the Apostolic Church on the general subject which we are here considering, will no doubt be interesting to our readers. Speaking of the Apostles, he says, "They formed the tribunal of appeal, the supreme, all-sufficient authority, as the inspired interpreters of the divine economy of salvation; and to this day their writings, those records of the Christian revelation in its primitive purity and freshness, remain the infallible rule of faith and practice. So far as the doctrine is concerned the apostles could challenge for their teaching unconditional obedience; for the Spirit of God gave them mouth and wisdom, and spoke through them in an infallible manner; and it is not at all to be imagined, that they suffered themselves here to be corrected or interfered with in any point by the congregations, which in fact owed to them their very existence." "In view of this universal avocation, the apostles were not only evangelists for the whole unconverted world (Matt. xxviii. 20), but at the same time the living bonds and the personal representatives of the inward and outward unity of the churches already organized." "With all this comprehensive authority, however, with all their personal independence in their respective spheres, by virtue of which, Paul, for example, once even rebuked the distinguished apostle, Peter, much his superior in office, the apostles still regarded themselves always as a collegiate body, and exercised their power, as organic members of such a body and under a sense of responsibility to it." See pp. 514, 515. "We have already remarked that the ministerial office was originally one and the same with the apostolical. But as the Church outwardly and inwardly grew, the apostles found their sphere of labor so enlarged, that they

could no longer attend alone to all the duties of discipline and public worship, and were compelled to resort to a division of labor. In this way arose gradually, as the wants of the Church and the force of circumstances required, the several offices, which have their common root in the apostolate, and through it partake in various degrees of its divine origin, and its powers, its privileges and duties." P. 498. "The design of the Christian ministry is none other that that of the mission of Christ himself,—the redemption of the world from sin and error." The spiritual office, or the ministry, is the vehicle of the powers of divine grace; the appointed channel for conveying the blessings of the gospel to mankind; the organ through which the Holy Ghost acts upon the world, and gradually transforms it into the kingdom of God. It would be pleasant for us to quote more extensively from Dr. Schaff's admirable book; but time will not permit, and we can but refer our readers to the work itself, especially to the third book, which treats of Church Government.*

According to Dr. Schaff, and as we firmly believe, also according to the Bible, the apostolate was the primitive form of the ministry, the root out of which all others grew, whether it appears in the persons of Prophets, Evangelists, Presbyters,

---

* We have frequently had occasion to refer to it, and to study it for many years, and, it gives us pleasure, to say, always with profit and edification. It embodies all that is truly valuable in Neander's Training and Planting of the Church, and Rothe's great work without their blemishes. It exceeds them both in beauty of spirit, and, what is of much greater account, has a much more orthodox ring, and is also more biblical. It advocates also much higher views of the Church and the ministry, in which we feel a defect in both Neander and Rothe, especially the former. It is, therefore, with sincere pleasure we learn that, together with the author's History of the Ancient Church, it has met with so favorable a reception in Germany as well as in this country; it is equally well adapted to both hemispheres: in Germany it cannot but exert a beneficial influence; for, whilst German theologians may speculate on the idea of the Church, they seem to have no power to carry out their idea. Most probably it will providentially be left to such practical countries as England and the United States to do this for them. We would recommend the work to clergymen generally. As an introduction or key, to the volumes on Church History which follow, it will be found to be particularly valuable. To private Christians also, it is well adapted for the purpose of edification, and we think it should be in all Christian families. The Latin and Greek quotations need not be read; the body of the book is in the vernacular, and so transparent in style that all may understand it.

Deacons or Bishops. As in the beginning, so in all ages, the sacred office lies at the foundation of the Church, and it must have the power of perpetuating itself and of adapting itself to the wants of believers and the circumstances of the times. The particular form, by which it was conferred in the times of the apostles, as well as ever since, was by the laying on of hands, or *Ordination*. Thus Paul, referring to this function of the ministry, exhorts Timothy to lay hands suddenly on no man, and defines the qualifications of elders and deacons, so that he may ordain no persons, except such as are qualified for the office. He also exhorts his disciple not to neglect the gift which was given him by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery or college of elders (1 Tim. iv. 14). In another place (2 Tim. i. 6), referring no doubt to the same transaction, he includes himself among the presbytery that laid hands on him. Rothe sees in these passages nothing but the imputation of a charism, and not a standing institution of the Church; whilst Dr. Schaff looks at it differently, and, as we think more correctly, considers it ordination. "After the election," he says, pp. 502, 503, "followed the ordination, or the solemn induction into office by prayer, and the laying on of hands (a ceremony borrowed from Judaism, comp. Num. xxvii. 18), the *symbol and medium of the communication of the grace prayed for and necessary for the office.*" "At all events the part taken by the presbyters can have been no mere empty ceremony, any more than the participation of the congregation in the choice of officers, but *presupposes a right and power lodged in their official character of conveying the necessary spiritual gift.*"*

* In emphasizing these passages, it is not our wish to commit Dr. Schaff to any particular view or theory of ordination. They are simply the free and untrammeled expression of his views of this solemn act as derived from the Bible itself. It must, however, be admitted that they contrast strongly with the views current in our days, and maintained by many distinguished theologians, Lutheran and Reformed during the post reformation period. See Herzog's Real-Cyclopedia, Art. Ordination. In the bloom of the Reformation period, it had manifestly a much higher import than subsequently in the Protestant Church. Calvin, who may be considered good authority on this point, for all branches, of the Reformed Church at least, does not hesitate to call ordination a real sacrament of its own kind. "The imposition of hands," he says, "which is used at the introduction of the true pres-

With the ministry as its salient point, the Church commenced its growth and outward enlargement. From the start it was a perfect unity, a type of that future unity to which it is destined to attain, when it shall embrace the whole human family, as it embraced the first disciples at Jerusalem (Acts ii. 42–47). In order, however, that the pure and holy life which animated the first converts, might be extended, new arrangements had to be made. In the course of time the gospel spread from Jerusalem to all parts of the earth, and in order to preserve it in its purity, as well as to extend it, congregations were formed and organized, which served to mediate between it and the particular life of individuals. This trichotomy is a universal law. Every real existence or unity includes in it, genus, species, and individuals. So it is in a perfectly developed state, where municipalities take up its life and realize it in the life of individual citizens. So it must be also in the Church, which as a whole must externalize itself in communities or congregations, which serve as branches, to diffuse its general life through its membership out into the world. The congregation is in itself an organization, pervaded by a common life, but always in vital union with the Church as a whole, from which it derives its existence, and in union with which alone it can preserve a healthy state. The theory, that after the day of Pentecost, congregations sprang up in different parts of the world, self-subsistent and independent of each other, which were subsequently brought into external unity with each other, is contrary to the biblical account, and is ably refuted by Rothe (p. 192, § 26). As at Jerusalem, so elsewhere, they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship and in breaking of bread and prayers (Acts ii. 42). The tendency then, however, as in our days to such independency and selfishness was very great. The old antagonism between the Jew and Gentile was intense, and it was

---

byters and ministers of the Church into their office, I have no objection to consider as *a sacrament;* and, in the next place, it is declared by Paul to be not unnecessary nor useless, but a *faithful symbol of spiritual grace.* (1 Tim. iv. 14). I have not enumerated it as the third, among the sacraments, because it is not ordinary or common to all believers, but a special rite for a particular office. See his Institutes, Vol. ii. p. 626, edition published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, Phila. 1844.

revolting to the natural feelings even of many Christian Jews, that the unclean Gentiles should stand on a footing of equality in the same communion with themselves. The spread of the gospel among the heathen was distasteful to them, and even Peter, upon whom it devolved to preach the gospel first to both Jew and Gentile (Acts x. ch.), was called to account by believers of the circumcision for holding communion with men uncircumcised. Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, committed a still greater offence in their view by his activity in building up congregations out of heathen converts. He was regarded with suspicion, and his work in danger of being ignored by the Jewish Christians. A schismatical tendency sprang up, and the danger of division in the Christian family was imminent. The difficulty, however, was healed for the time being by the Synod of Jerusalem (Acts xv.), where the Gentile congregations were recognized, their rights and privileges secured to them, and the outward unity of the apostolic Church fully asserted. But this antagonism, with its accompanying evils, was not destroyed. It continued to harass the Church for many years, and seemed to increase in violence as the Apostle was successful in spreading the gospel among the heathen, as may be seen from his frequent reference to it in his epistles. What was to be done in these circumstances? In our days it most probably would have resulted in a division of the Christian family. Not so, however, in the earliest and purest age of the Church. The apostles here were of one mind on this point, and working together with great forbearance for human infirmity, they maintained the unity of the Church intact. Whilst the apostle John, with his doctrine of divine life and love must have exerted a silent, harmonizing influence among the congregations, the apostle Paul made use of more practical means to secure the same object. With him it was a matter of vital importance, that the Gentile churches should be acknowledged by the mother-church at Jerusalem, and stand in Christian communion with her. Accordingly, we find that he makes a journey to Jerusalem for this purpose, although he was dissuaded from doing so all along his journey, on account of its extremely perilous character. The outward occasion for this visit was the large collection, which had been

gathered for the poor saints at Jerusalem in Macedonia and Greece; the inward motive was the earnest desire that, with this plentiful supply for their bodily wants, he might show the brethren at Jerusalem the practical fruits of the gospel among the Greek Christians, their grateful love and pious zeal, and so knit together more firmly the two grand divisions of the Church. The perfect healing of the inward schism, which threatened to result in permanent separation and alienation among believers, must have appeared to him, with his conception of the Church, as the body of Christ, to be in itself worth any personal sacrifice of feeling he might make or any extreme peril he might incur (Acts xxi. ch.). He was "bound in spirit" to go up to Jerusalem, in which, in addition to his own sense of duty, he recognized the higher impulse of the Holy Ghost, which constrained him in this crisis to throw himself into the breach, in order to save the interests of Christianity, though he incurred the risk of losing his life. As on another occasion, he went up to Jerusalem to attend the council, bearing alms to his nation, so it was doubtless at this time, *lest he should run, or had run, in vain* (Gal. ii. 2); that is, that he and his Gentile congregations might be kept within the communion of saints, and that the whole Church might be one. So mightily did the principle of unity and catholicity work in the Apostolic Church.

But while the Church as a whole moved onwards towards unity, outward as well as inward, the same principle was at work also in the organization of single congregations. There was here Christian equality, but only in such a sense that whilst there was entire freedom in divine worship, often resulting in disorder and confusion, the ministerial office, as modified by circumstances, and the necessity of the case, was still the basis of each one of these subordinate organizations, and the means under God of their preservation in the unity of the faith, and of all growth and enlargement. Time, however, will not permit us at this time, to speak of the process of their internal organization in detail, nor of other developments of the Church at large as it passed from the hands of the apostles and pursued its onward course in history. Enough has been said to show

that Christianity and the Church are inseparable; that the one cannot be understood without a clear conception of the other; and that the divine human-life of our Redeemer has found a lodgment in the heart of humanity in an outward, objective, form of its own creation. In a subsequent article we shall resume the subject, and endeavor to trace out somewhat further the new stream of history, which took its start in the God-man.

Art. IV.—"TOUCH ME NOT; FOR I AM NOT YET ASCENDED TO MY FATHER."

BY REV. WALTER E. KREBS, ALLEGHENY CITY, PA.

Mary Magdalene had the honor of being the first of mortals to see the Saviour of the world after His resurrection from the dead. That He, who arose as conqueror of the devil, appeared first to her, out of whom He had cast seven demons, is a fact worthy of notice; it is remarked by the Holy Scriptures themselves (Mark xvi. 9). Her language to Jesus, whom she mistook for the gardener, was childlike and earnest. "Sir, if thou have borne Him hence, tell me where thou hast laid Him, and I will take Him away." A thrill of astonishment mingled with joy must have penetrated her inmost being as she heard Him, in His own peculiar tone, speak her name. "Mary!" Immediately turning and looking full upon Him, with the exclamation "My Master;" it is natural to suppose that she started at once to embrace His sacred person, whereupon He uttered the profound words, "*Touch Me not; for I am not yet ascended to My Father.*"

On entering into an examination of this divine utterance, it is necessary first of all to be reminded, that no alteration of the received text is at all admissible. The critical authorities, it seems, are unanimously on the side of the usual reading. The conjectures of certain commentators, who propose other readings as possibly the original, are merely conjectures, and nothing more. The words in the text stand there by inspiration.

The interpretations that have been given are many and various. Only the principal of these can we here consider. And as each one comes into consideration, it will be necessary to keep in mind that, to prove at all satisfactory, it must on the one hand attach a legitimate meaning to the word "touch," and on the other make due account of the ascension, showing how the as yet unaccomplished ascension could be a reason or cause to render the touch at the time improper or impossible. So much is demanded by the very form of words employed by the Saviour.

Take the view, which some have advanced, that her touch was intended to excite or confirm her faith in the reality of His resurrection. How could His non-ascension be assigned as a reason why she could not touch Him for that purpose? To show some connection with His ascension, we might indeed suppose, as Meyer does, that Mary was uncertain whether the Saviour stood before her with a *material* body, or having just returned from the Father to whom He had ascended, with a *spiritual* body; and that He forbid her touch, inasmuch as He could assure her by His words simply that He had not yet ascended, and consequently had not the spiritual body she supposed He might have. But if this had been her object, it could not be satisfactorily explained why Thomas, with a similar design, was directed to do the very thing with respect to which Mary was resisted. "Reach hither thy finger, and behold My hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side; and be not faithless but believing." It will not do to say that Mary was believing, and Thomas skeptical, for greater would be the reason why the former should be gratified rather than the latter. And besides, not only Thomas, but the rest of the eleven were invited to touch Him to assure themselves that He was not "spirit," but "flesh and bones" (Luke xxiv. 37–43). "Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself: *handle Me and see;* for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have."

Nor can we take the word "touch" here in the sense of "worship," as is the interpretation of others, as if the Saviour had said, "Do not worship Me now in My present condition,

but wait until it is proper for you to do so when I am ascended and exalted." In this view, due account is made of the ascension, but a forced interpretation is put upon the word "touch."

It is nowhere else used in such a sense. Moreover, worship offered to Him before His ascension He did not forbid. Even before His death and resurrection, He was worshiped, as by the man born blind (John ix. 38.), by the mother of Zebedee's children, (Matt. xx. 20), and others. Not many minutes after He had said to Mary, "Touch Me not," He showed Himself to the other women as they were returning from the tomb, and they *held Him by the feet and worshiped Him.* The eleven too, when they met Him on the appointed mountain in Galilee, *worshiped* Him (Matt. xxviii. 9, 17). In every instance the same word is used by which *divine* worship is denoted. Why should He deny to Mary what He permitted in the case of the other women, and of the eleven?

Closely allied to this is the following view. "Do not cling to My earthly appearance, and expect that the former intimacy can still subsist between us. For though I am not yet ascended, I soon will be, in which exalted state all such intimacy with you in your yet fallen state will be precluded." Now it is true that the relation existing between Christ and His disciples after His ascension was different in form and character from that before, but that it was less cordial and intimate, we have positive scriptural warrant, as we shall afterwards see, to deny. This objection is here formally made apparent by the necessity of supplying the arbitrary phrase "soon will be." The words, "To My Father, and your Father; to My God, and your God," as Olshausen justly observes, "express the idea of an *approximation* of the disciples to the person of Christ."

Perhaps the most common and popular interpretation is, in brief terms, the following. "Do not consume any time now in touching Me, for I am not yet ascended, and before I do ascend you will have many opportunities of so doing, but go now without delay and tell My disciples that I am risen from the dead." So, in substance, Doddridge, Bengel, and others. Now it is to be observed that the message which Mary was directed to bear had reference, not to His *resurrection,* but to His *ascension.*

She had already communicated to Peter and John the fact that His body was not in the sepulchre, who, having run thither to see for themselves, had departed again, believing in His resurrection. And this view is objectionable, just because it makes so little account of the *ascension* as distinguished from the resurrection. According to it, the only reason why He mentions the ascension at all is to show Mary that she had plenty of time for her touching. This seems almost trivial. It is by no means compatible with the fact that the Saviour, not only assigns His *non-ascension* as the reason why she should not or could not touch Him, but also in immediate connection makes His *ascension* the subject of a direct message to His disciples. Having yet forty days, as we know, before His ascension, why such haste was necessary to communicate this message as not to allow Mary the few moments requisite for touching Him, whatever may have been her purpose, is a question that would remain to be answered. The other women were permitted to hold Him by the feet and worship Him, before the communication of *their* message (Matt. xxviii. 10); why should not Mary be permitted to touch Him, before the communication of *hers?*

The interpretation proposed by Schleiermacher, and seconded by Olshausen is, that He did not wish to be touched as His risen life was new to Him, and being fearful and susceptible, was anxious to avoid everything that might in any way interfere with that process through which He was passing from His resurrection to His ascension. No doubt it is true that there was a process of this kind, and that He came gradually to the full apprehension or experience of His resurrection life, but what reason have we to suppose that this could have been in any way interfered with or interrupted by Mary's touch? Olshausen himself confesses that he is by no means insensible to the singularity of the thought. If that were the state of His body, why did He *invite* the touch of Thomas? And even if we suppose that his touch was so long a time after, that He could now endure it, we cannot in the same way get rid of the touch of the other women which happened *immediately* after this manifestation to Mary. In the case both of these women and of Thomas,

as well as in that of Mary, He could have said, as far as His resurrection body was concerned, "*I am not yet ascended, therefore touch Me not.*"

In the positive consideration of these interesting words, after this brief review of various interpretations, it may be laid down as truths clearly established or plainly implied in the language itself, that Mary's attempted touch was different altogether in purpose and design from that of the other women and of Thomas, and that as such it could be realized not before, but only after, His ascension to the Father. What that purpose or design was is now to be determined. It may be true indeed that more was involved in her own action, and deeper was the meaning of the Saviour's reply, than she was able at the time to comprehend. This was frequently the case in regard both to what Christ said to His disciples, and what they did towards Him. "When therefore He was risen from the dead, His disciples remembered that He had said this unto them." "These things understood not His disciples at the first; but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of Him, and that they had done these things unto Him." Nevertheless Mary must have had her own particular object in view when she attempted to touch Him. What this object was, we have some clear scriptural facts to enable us in a great measure to determine.

The few things recorded of Mary Magdalene in the Holy Scriptures are enough to lead us to suppose that she was greatly attached to the person of our Lord. Actual contact with the object of love is the method by which that attachment is ordinarily exhibited or gratified. This was no doubt the primary motive of her attempted touch. So Mary, the sister of Lazarus, exhibited her overflowing feelings of gratitude for the restoration of her brother, by pouring upon His head and feet the pound of costly ointment of spikenard. So also the woman, who was a sinner, no doubt in thankful love for some great benefit received, "stood at His feet behind Him weeping, and began to wash His feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed His feet, and anointed them with

the ointment" (Luke vii. 38). Tradition makes this woman to be *Mary Magdalene*, the very subject of our consideration, on which account the early church appointed this gospel for her memorial. But whether it were Mary or not, both these interesting incidents show how woman exhibits her feeling towards the person of one by whom she has been befriended, or whom she loves. Mary Magdalene had been wonderfully benefited by Jesus. And she was the first of the women, who had prepared spices and ointments, to arrive at the tomb, in order *to anoint His body.* She came "early, when it was yet dark," (John xx. 1); the others not until "the rising of the sun." (Mark xvi. 2). She alone remained, when all others had gone, and was found weeping. Jesus honored her devotion and tears by manifesting Himself first to her in His risen state. "Woman, why weepest thou?" Her reply shows how greatly her love longed to pour itself even upon His lifeless body. Thinking she was addressing the gardener, "Sir, if thou have borne Him hence, tell me where thou hast laid Him, *and I will take Him away.*" With all these circumstances before us, what can we suppose would be the first impulse of so loving a nature, when she suddenly became conscious of its divine object standing alive before her, but to come near almost with a bound and embrace His sacred person.

In addition to this, we know also from the gospel narratives how wonderful an effect a simple touching of Jesus had upon the bodies of those who were diseased or possessed of devils. "As many as touched Him were made perfectly whole." That a blessing was imparted through bodily contact was clearly the belief of those women who brought their infants to the Saviour that He might *touch* them (Luke xviii. 15). The case of the woman with an issue of blood is remarkable. "If I may touch but His clothes, I shall be whole." She touched, and Jesus immediately perceived that "*virtue had gone out of Him.*" This is significant language! Healing power had been communicated from Christ to the woman immediately on her touch! "*Straightway* the fountain of her blood was dried up, and she felt in her body that she was healed of that plague." He

could indeed, and actually did, cure many, simply by His word and at a distance, but in some way or other the people had the idea that actual contact was the regular way. "They besought Him that they might touch if it were but the border of His garment." "They bring a blind man unto Him, and besought Him to touch him." Mary Magdalene herself was of the number of those women who had been healed by Him of evil spirits and infirmities (Luke viii. 2). He had cast out of her seven demons. In what way her cure was effected, we are not informed. But having been the recipient of His healing power, and, in common with the people, familiar at least with the fact that that power could be communicated by a simple touch, it is quite natural to suppose that she may have had lurking in her mind an idea that new power or virtue would be communicated by touching the Saviour in His new resurrection state.

In view of these facts we are justly led to believe that Mary attempted to touch or come into contact with the Saviour as an effect of, or for the sake of gratifying, her pure love, coupled perhaps with a vague notion that new life or power might be thereby imparted. But whether this latter idea was or was not in the mind of *Mary*, so far as *Christ* Himself was concerned, we have too many of His profound words, if we take only those recorded by St. John (who alone records the profound incident before us), as to leave any room for doubt that in *His* mind at least, was present the idea of *spiritual real contact with His person by the communication of His life through the operation of the Holy Ghost.* And if this idea were neither fully nor faintly in the mind of Mary, His reply was intended either to implant it there, or bring it into clear apprehension. And further, if at the time she was unable fully to comprehend His language, no doubt after the ascension, and the touching that thereupon followed, she was then in a condition to perceive it in all the force and beauty of a promise fulfilled. The Saviour was in the habit of leading the minds of His disciples from common and natural things and occurrences to those that were supernatural and spiritual, and to proclaim truths necessarily dark to be made clear only after the outpouring of the Holy Ghost.

The expression, "For I am not yet ascended," can imply only one of two things; either that the touching, which was not permitted just at that moment, would be permitted at some future time *before* His ascension; or that the touching which was not possible before, would be possible *after* His ascension. The former is excluded by the fact, as was previously observed, that the only reason of the prohibition would be the loss of a little time that would ensue, which seems almost trivial. The language is, not "I *will not* ascend for awhile," but "I *am not yet* ascended." The only alternative is, that what she attempted to do could be done in any real way only *after* His ascension. We, therefore, knowing what transpired after His ascension, can now look back, as no doubt Mary herself also afterwards did, and comprehend the full meaning of words so mysterious when uttered.

What now was it that so transpired? Nothing less than the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, the eleventh day after His ascension to the Father. Why did the Holy Ghost thus come? For the purpose of bringing to individuals the salvation of Christ, and building them as lively stones upon Him the foundation. With *His* coming the Saviour Himself returned, in a different but no less real form.* The difference may be thus expressed. In His previous state He was separate and alone, like a grain of corn before it is hid in the ground; but in His after state, He "saw His seed, and of the travail of His soul" (Isaiah liii.) by the real communication of His salvation through the Spirit to others, who, as grains of corn like unto Himself, came into existence, spring-

* "He had promised the disciples that, after ascending to the Father, He would return and remain with them forever. *Now* He had returned; and they might deem this to be the return which He had promised, and expect Him to remain with them thenceforth in the same form. He cautions them against so misunderstanding the promise as to cleave to Him in the form in which He then appeared, because He had 'not yet ascended to the Father.' After that event, when He should manifest Himself as the glorified one, were they to embrace Him wholly; obviously not in a natural, but in a spiritual sense. His stay in His then form was to be but transient; only after His ascension could He remain permanently, and that in another form."—*Neander's Life of Christ.*

ing up from His life. All this was possible only after His *glorification* (John xii. 23, 24). Not touching Him outwardly in the flesh, but touching Him inwardly by the implantation of His life in the centre of our being was the object of His incarnation. So also St. Paul says, "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more" (2 Cor. v. 16). Those who would show Him outward devotion, He always pointed to a higher union and communion. Martha exhibited her attachment by preparing for His bodily wants an excellent supper, but her sister Mary, who sat at His feet to hear His words, was preferred, and alone commended. The difference is observable too in the promise which He gave them, while He was yet visibly present, that He and His Father would come at some future time and make their abode with them (John xiv. 23). And what is apparently more contradictory still, while He was in the very act of disappearing from their gaze, the last accents that fell upon their ears as He went up, were, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The union between Himself and disciples was at first one of sympathy, of love, and outward association, but afterwards it was one of life, like that between the vine and the branches, the head and the members. The former fellowship, which they so much enjoyed, they had to learn to give up, in order to enjoy the latter. The latter was not possible until Jesus was glorified and the Holy Ghost given (John vii. 39). It was expedient for them that Christ should go away, for only then could the Spirit come (xvi. 7). Only then was the power given them to become the sons of God, and did they receive of His fullness (i. 12, 16); only then was the water given them to be a well of water springing up into everlasting life (iv. 14); only then could they come unto Him, to whom the Father had given to have life in Himself, that they might receive of that life (v. 26–40); only then could they eat His flesh, and drink His blood (vi. 62, 63). The Holy Spirit was to come, after His ascension, in order to quicken, to be a Comforter that should abide in them forever, but not to work in them independently or *de novo*, as if the foundation had not been laid, the vine not

planted, the fountain not established. His work was, not thus to set aside the Son, but to glorify Him; to take of the things of Jesus and show them unto His people; to comfort them, who were sad at parting, not by assuring them of His eternal separation, but by mediating His glorious spiritual presence.

With such scriptural truths before us, it is not hard to arrive at the full import of our Saviour's words to Mary, "Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended." Make no attempt to attain to that contact with Me, which will be possible only after My ascension and consequent outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

But it is to be further noted, that after refusing her touch at the present, and impliedly promising her this privilege in the future, He directed her to communicate the fact of His *ascension* to the *disciples*. This implies that *they* at least, calling to mind some previous instruction, would have clearer views of all that was involved for them in that glorious act, and what kind of touching would be thereafter possible. It remains for us to look at these instructions, as many as are recorded, and learn the lesson of the disciples.

The night immediately preceding His crucifixion He said unto them, "A little while," *i. e.* from this time to the cross, and then "ye shall not see Me, and again a little while," *i. e.* from His burial to His resurrection, as we might at first suppose, and then "ye shall see Me." But this "seeing Him again," even if He had not added another word, could not be taken to refer simply to the mere occasional glimpses which they had of Him during the forty days, as *they* would hardly have made up for that constant intercourse which they previously enjoyed, and been able to turn their sorrow into joy (John xvi. 22). But the matter is put beyond all doubt by His adding the significant words, "*Because I go to the Father.*" Their seeing of Him to their joy, involving as this does His presence by the Holy Ghost, was to be a consequence of His going to the Father. Hence the disciples could understand, to a greater extent than Mary, the words He addressed to her, and the message He sent to them: "Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended *to my Father;* but go to My brethren, and say unto *them*, I ascend to My Father and to your Father; and to My God, and your God."

On the same solemn occasion He also said, "At that day ye shall know that I am in My Father, and ye in Me, and I in you" (xiv. 20). "Ye in Me, and I in you" signifies the closest personal union, the most vital *contact*, conceivable. When was that to be known as a reality? "At that day." This clearly means, not the day of their death, or the judgment day, but the day of Pentecost.* For of no other day could He say, "Yet a little while, and the world seeth Me no more; but ye see Me; because I live, ye shall live also" (verse 19). Not at the day of their death certainly, nor at the day of judgment could it be said that they and not the world would see Him, that they would live because He lives—but on the day when the Spirit came, and He Himself returned in a higher form, according to His promise, "I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you" (verse 18). Now this promise follows immediately in connection with the promise of the Spirit (verses 16 and 17), and as a consequence of going to His Father (verse 12). All these things, His going to the Father, the coming of the Spirit, His own coming, and their living contact with Him, follow each other in a succession so regular and connected, that they could not help but be reminded of them, and be able to understand them better, when Mary came with the information that she had seen the Lord, that He had refused her touch because He had not yet ascended, and that He had directed her to tell them of His going to His God and Father, who was also theirs (xx. 18).

Nor is this the only reference to this subject in these last discourses of Christ to His disciples. They are full of such references. Not only does He repeatedly tell them that He is soon going to His Father, but He also reveals at the same time the benefits that would thereby accrue to them. We may appropriately conclude our discussion by quoting the words recorded in the sixteenth chapter, than which nothing could be plainer or more directly to the point. "Now I go My way to

* "The true knowledge of Him and of the Father was not connected with the corporeal resurrection of Christ, but with the outpouring of the Spirit in which Christ communicated life to His people, and in it the Divine essence which is accompanied by the true knowledge."—*Kendrick's Olshausen's Commentary, Vol.* II. *p.* 561.

Him that sent me," and as if to reprove them gently for having no appreciation, on account of their sadness, of what He had said, He continued, "and none of you asketh me, Whither goest Thou? But because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath filled your heart. Nevertheless I tell you the truth. It is *expedient for you* that I go away, for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but *if I depart, I will send Him unto you.* When He, the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth. He shall glorify Me; for *he shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you. All things* that the Father hath are Mine: therefore said I, that He shall take of *Mine*, and shall shew it unto you." On these last words, in reference to any distinction that might be made between the *showing* of truth and the *communication* of life, Olshausen makes the following just and forcible comment. "The only correct view of the words is that according to which, in the relations of Father, Son, and Spirit, no distinction whatever is made between *knowledge* and essence; the Divine essence itself is knowledge, and since the Son receives *knowledge* from the Father, He receives also *essence*, and so again the Spirit in like manner. And, as the Father glorifies the Son, and the Son again the Father, so the Holy Spirit also glorifies the Son, viz., not in Himself, but in the whole community of believers, the Church, wherein the life of Christ is manifested, which the Spirit brings to perfection."

Prepared and fortified as they were with such instructions, it would be the most difficult thing for us to explain, how the disciples could misinterpret or fail to understand the news and message of Mary. It is as if He had said: "You wish to touch Me, to come near to the object of your love, perhaps with some secret hope that by such contact with My risen body new grace or life may be communicated as you once experienced from Me in My previous state—your wish is a proper one and shall be gratified, in a more inward and real way, however, than you have any conception of at present—but this can come to pass only by the operation of the Holy Ghost, after My glorification at the right hand of the Father. Go tell My disciples, whom I

shall then call *brethren*—they are no doubt better prepared to understand My meaning—that I am now about to ascend, as I told them, unto Him, who as He is My Father and My God will by the communication of My life through the Spirit, also become their Father and their God."

Art. V.—PSYCHOLOGICO-MORAL REMARKS WITH REFERENCE TO THE HISTORY AND DOCTRINE OF THE FALL.

BY DR. K. H. SACK.

Translated by Rev. J. B. Kerschner, Mercersburg, Pa.

It has been said on various sides, that the Biblical history of the Fall is repeated in every man, and that this is a proof of its truth. Sensuality and pride, it is said, are still the two chief incitements to sin; and if Scholastic Theologians have disputed as to whether Adam's sin was *gula* or *superbia*, those who have maintained the one or the other, have had to acknowledge that the one is frequently found connected with the other. Indeed, neither the truth of the biblical narrative, nor the origin of sin in the first pair, can be sufficiently apprehended from such remarks; for that which takes place in us their descendants, is always in so far different as we are ever born with an inclination to unrighteousness, which is sin, so that every temptation to lust or pride coming from without, is always attached to an inner propensity—which was not the case with our first parents, and could not be, unless we are willing to make God the author of sin, which according to sound Theistical Conceptions must be absolutely guarded against. Nevertheless no acute thinker will regard the analogy between that which occurs in the soul of the grown man, as well as of the child, and the traditions with reference to the first sin, as insignificant, *i. e.* unimportant for understanding of the third chapter of Genesis. And if it could be shown that the psychological reflection on the temptation to transgress the Divine command and law, could be con-

tinued farther, be more sharply apprehended or more deeply known, it would not be too bold to suppose that the knowledge, of the biblical record would be enlarged, and confidence in its truth would thus, to a certain degree, be strengthened.

The following remarks are an effort to apprehend more in their unity than has yet been the case so far as I know, the elements of the sinful incitement, as they are continually found in the soul of every sinful man, without regard to the greater or less magnitude of the particular outward manifestations of sin.

1. The statement that sin is nothing but excessive sensuousness which has won the preponderance over the reason, must be denied even on the ground of every more thorough experience. Not only in adults is every sensuous transgression joined with self-elevation, pride, and hate, but even in children the sensual self-will is connected with at least a minimum of those supersensuous motions against the law and the idea of the good: obstinacy and defiance lie concealed in sensual desires; as then these show themselves often of less power, than the impulse to do that which is forbidden, simply *because* it is forbidden. Whence now comes this admixture of pride and self-elevation with sins of sense, since this inordinate sensuousness even presupposed, of its own nature, seems to lead to the doing of evil, and since it, *per se*, does not seem to be self-exaltation at all, but rather self-degradation to a degree that awakens the reproaches of conscience? To this we answer, that in every sin of sense there lies essentially and originally an incentive to *knowledge*, a wish to experience, to test how it really is with the sensual transgression of the Moral Law, what will come of it, and whether it is really true that evil consequences are to be expected from it for soul and body. This temptation to knowledge is always a wish to know about the good *and* the bad, under the supposed possibility that the forbidden sensuous evil is after all *no* evil, but something good, only another kind of the good which the law forbids. In this the supposition is implied too that the good forbidden is itself perhaps a kind of bad, or in other words, good and bad in the province of sensuous transac-

tions, are not at all essentially different; at least that it is worth the effort to become acquainted with the prohibited sensual by experience, whether it may not be good after all, and thus unjustly withheld. This stimulus of the desire of knowledge which can be traced ever into the apparently most minute as well as in the greatest sensuous transgressions, is *per se* already essentially pride, self-elevation, self-exaltation above the law given us by God, or some being standing above us, and revealing itself through our conscience—is an effort to be independent through knowledge, empirically and intellectually. The more inexperienced man is of God and the good, the more ignorant and childish the sensually sinning man is, the less is the sin of yielding to this thirst for knowledge. The more developed the thinking, knowing and judgment of a man is, the greater is the sin of sense; but in both cases it is in its essence both pride, and a striving for independence. The sin of the ripened man on the side of sensuality commonly is plainly defiance and pride. The evil incitement to knowledge in the child in its sensual transgressions is rather curiosity, impertinence, and at the same time, a moving of the power of thought, still always self-exaltation. A sin of sense without an impulse to knowledge, on the part of a sound-minded man, cannot be conceived of.

2. If now on the other hand we inquire into the nature of sins of self-exaltation, often revealing itself in sins which seem to be entirely isolated, we shall find them to be confessedly not only a presumptuous thinking of the subject of itself and things, a haughty self-consciousness, and in so far the satisfying of an impure thirst for knowledge (for not even an external deed of violence can be perpetrated without such an inner self-exaltation), but also (and this is important here) always essentially and originally sinful sensuality and *desire of pleasure*. For from every thought of himself and the world, which man effects *outside of the life in God*, freeing himself from the moral necessity of thinking God and His law at the same time and pre-ëminently a necessity revealing itself more and less powerfully in every human being—he promises a feeling, an enjoyment of self, which, no difference how abstract this thinking of the

world and self may be, is always of a sensuous kind; for the spiritual power of man, his entire thinking, is surrounded and borne by his psychico-somatic individuality. But now the selfish disorderly tension of any one side of the human self-feeling brings the other also into a morbid excitement, has its very origin in the corrupt root, the injured centre of the human nature; and thus the false thinking of the proud man is always at the same time sensual pleasure, either of a more refined or coarser kind. This explains on the one hand, how a proud thinking of one's self is generally connected with vanity, which, however refined, is a sensual pleasure in the trivial things of life; on the other, how men of great powers of thinking, when exercised in self-glorification, often manifest a defiant confidence in their physical strength, and not seldom are inclined to sensual excesses, as the biographies of so many men of genius in the sphere of art, and in revolutionary ages, plainly teach us. Is there not also in social life, so far as it is not supported by religious morality, in circles of unsanctified talent, a spiritual revelry in which the sensuo-sinful element is cherished, however refined or covered up? Thus the sins of sense are not only always connected with the sin of lofty thought, but exist essentially in this. And this is true of abstract thinking when it is presumptuous, as well as of empirical and practical judgment, when the objects of such judgment are looked at without pure selfishness, with more or less arbitrary subjective presuppositions, prejudice or deceptive imagination. From this also follows that every presumptuous attempt to know (wissen wollen), as it is, *per se*, unjust and sinful, because it is a tearing ourselves loose from life and thinking in God, and from the good of His law, involves in it a tendency to such a knowledge of evil, as places it, (the evil) on the same footing with the good; the idea being entertained that it is not really bad, or at least not absolutely bad, but only somehow less good than the opposite good: and that this good itself is, to a certain extent, also evil, because, like it, it may result in evil. This also explains the fact that the most presumptuous and irreligious forms of the attempt to know (wissen wollen), absolute Pantheism, and sys-

tematically consistent Materialism, involve the proposition of the identity of good and evil.

3. The psychological consideration of sin, as it still daily reveals itself in the human soul, gives from both sides, sense and pride, the same result, viz., that sensuality and self-exaltation are not accidentally or successively connected, but that they are originally and essentially *one*, *one* sin, *one* injustice, *one* hostility to God, which comes to light in one more as sensual degradation, in another more as presumptuous self-elevation, according to the individual disposition (anlage) of each man, also the temptation which meets him from without. What is then the point common to both, and how is it to be characterized? It is a false conception, an untruthful thought, an ungodly self-willing, by means of a fancy: that is the common root of every transgression of the Divine will, brought either internally or externally into the consciousness of the human soul. How such a conception, such a perverted thinking, this ungodly motion of the will (for every act of thinking participates in a motion of the will, even if it be only permitting an impression upon our five senses), ever came into man,—this can never be explained through an empirically observed impression made by the external world upon the soul. For the material world offers no temptation to sinful thoughts unless the tinder is already in the soul. The seduction of one man by another presupposes evil already present in the human species, thus only puts off the question. The fact that all men are, through their descent from father and mother, found to be infected with such false conception, with untruth, with lie and sin, in the widest meaning of the word, though it be as the unavoidability of a minimum, necessarily points not only the theological, but also philosophical thinker, back to the first sin of man, *i. e.* the sin of the first man. But as we are not only unable to know any thing about this by observation, but also because the case is different (from that of men born with sinful infirmity) on account of the innocence necessarily assumed (at least by theists and Theologians) of the first man, a going back to the Biblical tradition of the fall depends on the following

points :—1. In how far the features of the relations of the first men are analogous to that which takes place in men born in sin. 2. If such analogy must be acknowledged, to what degree the narrative, apart from the similarity of the temptations which happen to *us*, would become thereby incredible.

In the following we will endeavor to look more closely at these questions in close connection with what we have just found to be true.

1. The state of the first men can be thought of only as perfect innocence within their innate consciousness of God as the good Creator and Lord of them and the surrounding nature: Innocence, which had a consciousness of the possibility and duty of attaining, through continual living and remaining in God and His will, to an ever progressive knowledge of Him, as well as to an increasing enjoyment of every pleasurable thing. In accordance with this condition, there existed for the first men a satisfying unity of their knowledge of God, themselves and nature, and of their joy in God, themselves and nature. No antithesis between the natural and the supernatural existed for them, because nature in all its parts reflected back to them the kindness and wisdom of God. Their knowledge of the ethically good was a knowledge of their personal abiding in God's will; they knew about evil only as the divinely appointed limit of their activity; and this limit, drawn by a prohibition, could seem to them only good, because it came from the author of all the good surrounding them. To think this limit, was nothing bad, it was rather an exercise of their abiding in God in thought, feeling and will. The condition of the first man is designated in a way twofoldly false (1), when he is represented as possessing perfect wisdom and righteousness, as we find in Christ, considering Him merely as a man, or as we may think these to exist in a man when quite purified and morally perfected by grace. Such a condition would be in contradiction to the purposes of the Divine love, to lead man through self-activity into the full likeness of God. Nor would a fall from such a condition be conceivable. (2) But also an absolute equalization of the first human pair with chil-

dren, original sin being left out of consideration, cannot be the correct conception of them, for they had within themselves a knowledge of the being, dominion and love of God, not through reflection, but through immediate life, and at the same time possessed the ability to so rule over nature, under God, as well as the capacity for this insight into things; nothing of all this is found or can be found in the most innocent children. The first men knew enough to be able to act properly and in communion with God, and they knew of evil only thus, that it was the possibility of an activity through which they would cease to be in God, in which their joy consisted.

Now how did it happen that this human pair could and did forsake this condition? The Bible says, It happened through the temptation of the evil spirit who enticed them to a twofold sin, absolutely united into one, to the pleasure of sensual enjoyment, which had been forbidden them, and to the attainment of a knowledge like that of God. (Gen. iii. 5, 6).* Only the two together, as proceeding from the one forbidden act, could constitute a temptation for the first men. Not to sensual enjoyment *per se*, for in the fullness of that granted them to enjoy, and to be enjoyed in accordance with the will of God, a particular thing could afford no other temptation, than just through their ignorance why it was forbidden, thus through the expectation of a *knowledge* which would render them independent. A mere presumptuous longing to know more than they would experience and know in a progressive walk with God, alone could not come into their souls, for their knowledge of God, and of things as

---

* Luther's translation of v. 6, followed by Meyer and Stier (also by the Eng. Vul.) "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, dafs es ein lustiger Baum wäre *weil er klug mach te*" (*because it made one wise*) is to be decidedly preferred to that of De Wette, "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, *und der Baumo lieblich anzuschauen war* (and the tree was *pleasant to behold*); partly because the 2d and 3d members of that which is designated as being perceived by the woman would be, (according to De Wette's translation) perfectly tautological, partly because the Hiphil of שָׂכַל with the causative meaning of "to make wise" occurs in several passages. Also the connection between v. 5, and even v. 11, and the question how Adam knew that he was naked, leads clearly to the meaning, "to make wise."

being in Him, stood in the most satisfying relation and equilibrium with the extent of their capacity for emotion and enjoyment, thus a desire to know more could be a temptation, only then when it appeared as an enlargement of their sensual enjoyment by one hitherto unknown.

Thus the strongest possible, yes, the only possible enticement which could be brought to bear on their souls, developed itself by means of a temptation offered to them, in a magical way, mysteriously exciting the depths of both sides of their being, that of thought and that of sense; and following the enticement without compulsion, they fell, the sin was committed and left behind ineffacable traces in their nature.

This temptation, as it could only come to them from without, was possible only in the form of a lie, for before immediate confidence in the goodness and truthfulness of God, based upon the totality of their condition, had been shaken, there could be for them neither an incitement to greater pleasure nor to greater knowledge. Only when it had been held up to them that the word of prohibition given to them was not good, because the presupposition of the evil of that which was to follow the transgression was not true, thus that God was not good and truthful, then only was it possible that the twofold, and nevertheless one, incitement, through knowledge and trial of the forbidden, to enjoy a hitherto unknown sensual pleasure, and to attain, just through this pleasure, to a knowledge which would, for the future, release them from restraining distinction between good and evil, and thus make them independent of God, led them to sin. Thus a lie which annihilated the truth of their intellectual life resting in God, mistrust which killed their childlike trust, unbelief which deprived them of the inner power to persevere in the life in God, was the root of the first sin.

All this agrees in the most remarkable way with what we found, in a psychologico-empirical way, to be the continuous cause of all human sin, viz., that a false thought, a vain conception, lies at the basis of every sin whether of sense or of pride, begetting both; one is always essentially unbelief in God and mistrust of His Word.

Of course the identity between the origin of sin as contained in the biblical tradition, and that of the particular sins of the following generations is not absolute; for in the former the temptation comes merely from without, in the latter, while it is indeed conditioned by something outward; seen, heard, or simulated, always at the same time attracts itself to something untrue and impure already internally present: however often the one may have the advantage of the other. But this inequality, necessarily involved in the acknowledged condition of innocence of our first parents, is outweighed by the equality of the essential elements of sin in both provinces, and especially by what we have proved in regard to the connection and identity of the impulse to pleasure and to knowledge, while this equality cannot properly be understood if we, with reference to one or the other province, consider sense by itself, or pride by itself as the essence of sin.

2. With all this we by no means deny that even acknowledging this analogy, the origin of the first sin contains something incomprehensible to us, but only in the same way that there is something inconceivable, not to be fully comprehended, in the ethico-religious province in general, which, however, is not absolutely unintelligible, and as there is still continually something incomprehensible in every greater or smaller sin committed in the world, so that every more or less sincere man has to say to himself: It is inconceivable how I could commit this injustice, this fault, this sin. In this respect the never-to-be-forgotten Daub has thought that evil is incomprehensible, is a miracle, but just an evil miracle.* In this situation of things we have the less cause to allow mistrust of the truth and actuality of the biblical account, to be awakened in us, through so to speak the more externally strange and incomprehensible fact, the speaking of the serpent, and its being an organ in the service of the father of lies. Both the equality and inequality with that which we daily experience in us and among us is so striking and so intelligible that we need not go into the particulars.

To us at least it seems impossible to regard that as a myth in

* Ch. *Daub's* Judas Iscariot, Heft. (1818) P. 99.

which *not* an idea, wrapped up in history (which is the nature of a myth) is conveyed, but something which is the opposite of all idea, evil, which is only a fact, and is reported as first having come into the world. However, the author of this has not aimed at a criticism and exegesis of the 3d chap. of Genesis.

We now pass on to some practico-moral deductions from the above propositions.

1. Let him who is in earnest about his moral preservation and development, especially if he has placed himself under the influence of the grace of the gospel, separate from every sensual enjoyment which is right in itself, as it can be taken up into the ethico-religious life of sobriety and love (the Christian complement of what the ancients ment by *σωφροσυύη*), abstract reflection as to whether and the how far this enjoyment is good or not, any attempt to know and comprehend as well the good contained in it, as the evil possibly attaching to it; a tendency in which there is danger of unnaturally potentializing the good contained in it, or of occasioning the possible abuse by forming conceptions of and thinking about it. Let him enjoy in childlike gratitude simply and cheerfully, and just for that reason moderately, mixing along with it nothing foreign, lofty, spiritually idealizing. Such a wish to apprehend the enjoyment of nature, of eating and drinking, of bodily comfort, is always a more or less morbid and vain wish to know the empirical in its connection with the spiritual, and is not only pedantic but proud, and a more refined self-enjoyment by subtilizing by departing from thankfully receiving at the hands of God. To this is allied that whole province of a vain, empty super-acute nicety separating from all sound life, which works so freezingly on the feeling, so weakening upon will and deed, and is related to what a great poet has called "des Gedankens Blässe." To this also belongs the curiosity which attaches itself to the social intercourse and conversation in every day life, for why need we seek to know what may lie possibly behind any natural view? Here too are the roots of all superstitions and false theosophic investigations. Every man who wants

everywhere to investigate, and comprehend where he ought only to see, hear, feel and use his sound senses, who gazes at a thing falsely—philosophizing about it isolates it, is on the way to lose his understanding, which is the beginning of conceitedness in knowledge (wissens dünkel).

2. In the effort to attain knowledge, whether in judging the things of common life, or in the scientific treatment of empirical provinces, or of universal ideas, let a man guard himself from suffering his thinking to fall into by-paths where an egotistical self-enjoyment or sensual pleasure becomes mixed with it. Therefore a clear, purely objective view of all natural relations is so important, so that no side thought no matter how enticing may mislead the view. To this must be referred every selfishly entertained presupposition in the investigation of scientific questions which immediately may become a prejudice, every decision of a result before hand, yes, every looking to the result which an investigation, a learned treatise, may have in the circle of those who pass judgment on it. Also an intentional, especially a self-pleasing looking back to an accomplished work can easily draw our spirits into a vain, and so, sensual pleasure, over against the beautiful, truly religious, but not easily practicable principle of the noble French Jansenist. If we have done anything we must forget it in God. Yet more dangerous is that enhancement of the powers of soul and spirit, which is needed for a literary work, through the use of spirituous drinks whereby the work is even begun in an unsound way. We have not meant to say that a psychico-sensual self-feeling natûrally accompanying spiritual exertion is sin. In proper subordination it is good, a gift of the divine kindness.

3. Poetry and Art in themselves aim at neither knowledge nor sensual enjoyment, but excite thoughts and judgments, emotions and sensuous perceptions: all art rests on the appearance of the spiritual in a sensuous form. Whoever, without a pure sense for the beautiful, occupies himself with Poetry and Art, whether by way of production or contemplation, is exposed to a double temptation, viz., on the one hand of apprehending the idea of a work of art, with abstract thoughts, on the other

hand of enjoying the *form* with a sensual-unrefined feeling. On this rests the decay and abuse of art, which in turn helps on the errors of empty hypercriticism, and falsely-refined desire of enjoyment. For example the Romance is a poetical work, or should be; but if it is so written that the human spirit appears as called to a proud self-sufficiency and independence of God, or as entitled to a favorite sensual enjoyment, it works destructively on the true life of the soul.

4. As the sphere of pedagogics in a wider sense belongs to ethics we offer some remarks on the combating of the love of pleasure and self-exaltation in the youth, by means of education. Every pleasure, every enjoyment of the senses which is to be granted to youth, ought to be kept right far from vain reflection, and sophistical subtilizing; let it remain open, fresh, joyous, childlike. In this respect gymnastic practice in common is of great worth, when adventuresomeness and ostentation are excluded.

Then, too, much depends, in the development of the spiritual powers of the young, in the training of the understanding, on their not being spurned on by the enticements of sensual rewards and promised enjoyments, by giving vain praise of talents and their consequences; rather by acknowledgments of their moral fidelity, and exertions it, of course, being presupposed that the spirit be not over-done, that an unhappy precocity do not introduce the mind of the boy or youth into spheres which may deceive him in regard to his real talents. Never let mere knowledge appear to the young as the highest destiny, or as self-enjoyment of the soul, but continually, on the one hand with reference to the highest object of knowledge, God to be loved, on the other hand in agreement with manfully active life. Let the art of learning and scientific effort themselves always appear as such (a practical life). Hence it is important also that in introducing the young into the world of ancient classical literature, neither the autonomy nor the beauty of form of the ancients be placed before their eyes as the highest; for the former would tempt them to self-conceit, the latter to sensuality. Assuredly this twofold error can only be avoided when the re-

ligious warrant the absolute moral worth of genuine faith, and of free obedience, the thorough knowledge of God and Jesus Christ, is advanced by a religious instruction, *which* does not seem to be one branch of instruction alongside of others, but by becoming the religious life-element of the school, pervades all other instruction and alone gives to taste for science, literature and native country its proper consecration.

Art. VI.—GERMAN RATIONALISM AND ITS LESSONS FOR THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

BY REV. J. G. ZAHNER, D.D., NEW PHILADELPHIA, OHIO.

We use this term in its historical sense, not as simply denoting skepticism or infidelity as it may be found, at the present time, in the German Fatherland, but as *the technical name of the mighty effort of the human mind to throw off all authority of the Christian Church, and to subvert Christianity itself as far as it lays claim to be a divine revelation*, forming an important period in the history of German Protestantism, dating from the middle of the seventeenth century and running down to our own time. German Rationalism, in this sense, is not a mere episode, but an eventful phase in the history of German Protestantism, without which it is impossible to account for the present condition and form of the German Protestant Church and German Protestant Theology.

German Rationalism, differing in many respects from English Deism and very materially from French infidelity, has been defined by its more worthy representatives as the mode of thinking which finds it necessary to subject Revealed Religion to the test of our innate reason and other reliable means of human knowledge; but, in fact, it is the mode of thinking which makes common sense the criterion of divine truth, tearing down all the main pillars of Christian truth and reconstructing the various branches of theology, according to the adopted test, no matter

what the results of this mode of procedure would be. But to be able rightly to judge of the nature, rise and progress of German Rationalism, and especially of its scientific and practical results, it will be necessary to cast a glance on the previous history of German Protestantism.

The precious fruit of the Reformation of the sixteenth century was the freedom and independence of the Christian Church, in various European countries, from the tutelage and tyranny of the papal hierarchy, the emancipation of the consciences of God's people from the thraldom of the legal or Judaistic Church system of the middle ages, and, as a further consequence of all this, the establishment of the Protestant Church on the basis of what has since been called the material and formal principle of Protestantism, viz., the justification of the sinner before God by faith only through the merits and righteousness of Christ, and the exclusive normative authority of the canonical books of the Old and New Testament Scriptures in all matters of faith and life, over against the papal dogma of the meritoriousness of good works and the co-ordinate normative authority of Church tradition. Thus we see that Protestantism, in its formative period, was not a mere negation of error, but a powerful affirmation and a deeper apprehension of divine truth, and for this reason, also a positive advance on the previous Church life. Yet the new turn, which, in that time, the Christian mind had taken, was not without its peculiar dangers, and most of the Reformers entertained, in the latter part of their lives, the most serious misgivings as to the ultimate consequences of their work. History shows that these misgivings were not without some foundation. The Protestant movement had not progressed very far, when among its chief leaders serious doctrinal differences (the sacramental controversy) arose, which ultimately resulted in two separate organizations, viz., the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. Other phenomena, growing out of the Protestant movement, were still more ominous. Carlstadt and his friends pressed the formal principle of Protestantism in such a manner as to destroy all significance and power in the holy

sacraments as well as all proper Church authority, and it required the strong faith and the mighty eloquence of Luther to repel this heresy. The Anabaptists of Germany and the German Swiss Cantons perverted the doctrine of evangelical liberty into unbridled licentiousness, which resulted in social and political disorders and temporary anarchy. The libertines openly made war against Calvin and his institutions in Geneva, boldly proclaiming the emancipation of the flesh. Others, less fanatical and less immoral, nevertheless threw aside the articles of our common undoubted Christian faith as embodied in the three ancient creeds, substituting in their place their own philosophical notions. Such were, for instance, the early Anti-trinitarians and Socinians, mostly wandering fugitives from papal countries. But these fanatics and ultras of the reformation constituted thus far not the ruling but only the disturbing force of the Protestant movement. Their horrible extravagances and pernicious errors were instinctively repelled by the Christian consciousness of the age. They soon disappeared or sank into insignificance, having made no lasting impression on the Protestant communities.

Roman Catholicism, invigorated by the opposition of Protestantism, assumed its definite form in the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent (1545–63): Lutheranism in the Form of Concord (1577), and the Reformed Churches principally in the Heidelberg Catechism (1563), the second Helvetic confession (1566), the thirty-nine Articles (1571), and the canons of the Synod of Dort (1618–1619). The deadly strife between the old and new systems of faith nevertheless continued, and in France, Holland, and partly also in England and Scotland, Protestantism had to pass through the fiery ordeal of bloody persecutions and religious wars. In Germany the conflict was chiefly carried on with word and pen; yet the thirty years' war had to teach the conflicting parties that the only possible relation they could sustain to each other was peaceful toleration with equal rights for them both.

The *internal* history of German Protestantism from Luther's

death to the close of the thirty years' war shows a decline of the original spirit and life of the Reformation. The unhappy sacramental controversy between Luther and Zwingli and their respective friends already indicated a tendency to intellectualism and doctrinalism, and this tendency grew stronger and stronger, until angry controversialism and stiff dogmatism was the order of the day. Christianity was treated as a mere system of divine doctrine, and the Reformation was looked upon as a revival of *pure* doctrine. To comprehend and express this doctrine in clear and correct dogmatic formulas and to defend and preserve the same against all adversaries and errorists, became the chief labor of the Theologians. Thus the old scholastic method was introduced into Protestant Theology, and the original freshness and biblical simplicity, the vigor, life and unction that characterized the dogmatical productions of the Reformation period (as for instance Calvin's institutio religionis Christianæ and Melanchthon's Loci communes) had given way to the subtilties and minutiæ of the ponderous volumes of Calovius, Kœnig, Quenstedt and others. The same one-sided dogmatism and controversialism had, with few exceptions, also taken possession of the pulpit. The results of all this were most deplorable. With the masses of the people, Christianity had almost become a mere matter of opinion and a routine of religious observances; yet the stagnation of the life and spirit of true Christianity was by no means general or complete. The afflictions of the thirty years' war and the labors of men like John Arndt, H. Müller, J. V. Andreæ and P. Gerhart, kept the ardor of practical Christianity alive in a great many congregations and individual members of the German Church.

From the middle of the seventeenth century, a new period began. Religion was no longer the all-engrossing subject among the European nations. The political and mercantile interests made themselves more and more felt. The wars continued, but their motives were other than religious. The mighty controversy between Roman Catholicism and Evangelical Protestantism and also between the Lutherans and the Re-

formed had now expended its vital force and almost entirely ceased. Calixtus, at the head of the Lutheran University at Helmstædt, proclaimed a Christianity independent of the Form of Concord, existing in the Bible, in the ancient creeds and in the practical life of Christians. He endeavored to establish peaceful relations between the Lutherans and Reformed and called on the Roman Catholic Church in Germany to break loose from the Pope. Spener, possessing a pious heart and a liberal education, labored for another reformation of the Protestant Church in Germany, a reformation of life, not of doctrine, by means of a more simple and edifying explanation of the Holy Scriptures, the restoration of the general priesthood of believers, and the education of a pious ministry. Thus he became the Father of German Pietism. But Spener and his immediate friends, true sons of the Lutheran Church, had no desire to undermine the Church of their fathers or to deny any of her doctrines, but only to revive and promote practical piety among her ministers and lay members. For this important and desirable end they labored with great earnestness and great success. The new movement, having found its centre at Halle, made itself felt throughout all Protestant countries in Europe, yet with greater strength in Lutheran than in Reformed communities, for the simple reason that these latter had preserved more of the original spirit of the Reformation and had always been more practical and less theoretical in their Church life.

But modest and sober Spener soon found occasion to complain, that "His friends caused him more trouble than his enemies." Starting out with what appeared to them rightful opposition to the reigning dogmatism and controversialism of the times, a great many suffered themselves to run into the other extreme of a purely subjective piety. They became indifferent with regard to the Church, her sacraments, her confessions of faith, her ministry and, in fact, made their own subjective experience the criterion of divine truth. So much of the doctrines of the Bible and the symbolical books, as they could use for "moral application," was retained; all the rest was given to

the winds.* Fanatical extravagancies followed, and this rampant individualism and excited subjectivism paved the way to another and more dangerous enemy of the Protestant Church of Germany, viz., *Rationalism.*

The tendency of the age became more and more to emancipate the human mind from all authority and restraint, and, in fact, to elevate, on the one hand, individual religious experience and on the other individual human reason above the written word of God, and the unanimous voice of the Christian Church in her past history. Here unchurchly degenerated Pietism, running out into various mystical sects, and anti-christian Rationalism met on common ground.

It is indeed, very significant and instructive to see how the University of Halle, the centre of Pietism, where men like Franke, Breithaupt and Anton taught, became in a short time, as it were, the mother of German Rationalism, and that even the Frankean charitable institutions, those monuments of a living faith, passed over into hands of Neology. We need only call the attention of the reader to the labors and writings of Thomasius, Wolf, Semler and Niemeyer to show the correctness of this statement.† It was during the latter part of the seventeenth century that in Germany Pietism and incipient Neology had made a common stand against the reigning Orthodoxy of the times, but when early in the eighteenth century it became evident, that the anti-Church tendency was, in fact, an anti-Christian tendency, when English Deism and French skepticism made their inroads into German literature, when mystics, like Dippel and Edelmann, turned Rationalists, and many orthodox theologians and active pastors began to waver, and did accommodate themselves in language and expression to the new mode of thinking, then the true friends of Christ everywhere, whether of the old or new school, rallied again to the defence of their common cause; and many of those who had foolishly

---

* Theological students of Halle used to write in the albums of friends, sentences like these:—Vel Turca sis vel Hebræus Appella: qui bene vivit, erit Christicola mihi.

† The opponents of Halle brought into vogue the proverb: Halam tendis, aut pietista aut atheista reversurus.

suffered themselves to join in the anti-church warfare were thus brought to see the error of their way.*

But Rationalism now became the ruling power in Protestant Germany. Unlike English Deism, which had its origin outside the Church and openly proclaimed its hatred to Christianity, German Rationalism, arose in the bosom of the Church, and boldly claimed to be the legitimate child of the Reformation. Not to come into open conflict with the formal principle of Protestantism, viz., the normative authority of the Holy Scriptures, its teachers and defenders received the Bible as the vehicle of the new religion of reason, and endeavored to show that the Scriptures rightly interpreted taught nothing more than natural theology teaches. The work of disintegration and destruction in every department of theology and the Church, was carried on, without any hesitation, until the grand old structure was pulled down to the ground. Not only the peculiar scholastic form, in which the doctrines of Christianity had been handed down by previous ages, but these doctrines themselves, root and branch, were rejected. It was not long till the old Liturgies and Hymn-books were also put aside or had to undergo a process of modernization.

German Rationalism has its own history. Indifference and aversion toward the Church and her confessions led to indifference and aversion toward the Apostles and their writings and finally even to the denial of the divinity of Christ. Prof. Semler of Halle, raised and educated under the influence of Pietism, represents the transition from unchurchly Pietism to antichristian Rationalism. Notwithstanding his "private piety," as he called it, he hated the Church and her dogma, and his bold critical and historical researches gradually led him to a denial of the divine inspiration, the authenticity and integrity of

---

* It must be stated, in this connection, that Pietism in Wurtemberg under the leadership of Dr. Bengel, Oetinger, Steinhofer, Roos and others, was of a churchly nature, and this is one great reason why Rationalism could not get a firm foothold in that country. We meet with the same results in those Reformed Churches in Germany, which did not give up their precious inheritance to any of the unchurchly *isms* of their time.

the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, the biblical prophecies and miracles. The flat common sense philosophy of Wolf, Lessing's controversy with Pastor Gœtze; the favor shown by Frederick the Great, to the leaders of French infidelity and English Deism; the writings of Basedow, Nicolai, Bahardt and others, made common Rationalism predominant in Germany. All of Christianity and Theology was given up, except the moral precepts of the Gospel, the idea of God and His providence and the freedom and immortality of man. Human reason was thus enthroned supremely over divine revelation, and common sense adopted as the only measure or rule of truth, human or divine.

Through Kant's criticism, German Rationalism received a more precise and scientific form. In his "Kritik of pure reason," he endeavored to show, that human reason as such could have no certain knowledge of any thing beyond the visible world; that, strictly speaking, the existence of God and the immortality of the human soul were only postulates of practical reason; that is to say, that the moral nature of man demanded them. In like manner, Kant would neither assert nor deny the possibility of a divine revelation. In any way, morality was to him the all in all in Religion. But this Kantian Rationalism, although a great deal more earnest, and not as shallow and arrogant as vulgar Rationalism, was nevertheless unable to stem the strong current of the negative tendency of the age, because it lacked the living root of all true morality, faith in Christ Jesus, the true God-man, the ideal and personification of all holiness. The systems of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, followed each other in quick succession, and seemed, for a while, more favorable to orthodox Christian Theology than to modern Rationalism; but through Strauss and his abettors, it became soon evident, that, in the bold speculation of Hegel, German Rationalism had reached its most consistent, and therefore its most destructive form. The half-way work and inconsistencies of common Rationalism were unsparingly exposed, and, for earnest science, forever put aside. It came to this; either Christ or Belial; no halting between the two. The his-

toric character of the Gospels was entirely denied and the biblical narratives declared to be myths. The relation of Christ to the Church was reversed. According to this speculative Rationalism, Christ had not founded the Church, but the early Church had unconsciously produced Christ, taking up in their vivid imagination the Messianic hopes and expectations, then in vogue among the Jewish people. The whole heavenly world was declared to be the product of religious imagination, without any objective reality; and God Himself, the infinite Creator, was identified with the finite spirit of man. The cultus of human genius and the emancipation of the flesh were boldly proclaimed. This Pantheism, consistently carried out, will end in the destruction of Christianity and the Church, the overthrow of all civil institutions and the dissolution of human society. In the French revolution at the close of the last century, we have had a practical exemplification of its destructive spirit. It is Anti-Christ in full.

It is not our task now to show, how by the grace of God, German Protestant Theology, Phœnix-like, arose from the ashes of the general conflagration that had swept over its whole field, and how, in consequence thereof, the Church also arose from her ruins. Suffice it to say that both came out of the furnace not exactly in their old shape and form (much of the wood, hay and stubble had been burned), but in a renewed state, centering in Christ, the God-man, and not in any mere single dogma or scientific principle as such. That Christianity is essentially a divine life, sprung from Christ, the Prince of Life, and not mere doctrines; that the Church is His body, mater fidelium and cœtus sanctorum, "Samlerin, Spenderin der, Gnadenmittel" and "gesammelte Gemeinde" constitute the central ideas of this regenerated Theology.

Old Protestant dogmatism could not withstand the tremendous shock of Rationalism, much less modern Supranaturalism, because the principium rationis was more or less involved in these systems.

In conclusion, we shall yet call the attention of the reader to

a few practical inferences or lessons to be drawn from our subject for the benefit of our American Churches.

1. Like causes produce like results. The dry, lifeless traditional Theology, which to a greater or less extent is found among the ministers of the different denominations of the country, cannot really satisfy the religious wants of our age. It will not successfully withstand the anti-christian forces at work in our nation; nor be able scientifically to overcome the growing skepticism and materialism of the age. It will not even succeed in successfully foiling the aggressions of Rome.

2. The religious individualism of our sect system, although full of life and action, will not save the Church and the nation. It carries the principle of its dissolution in its own bosom. It is essentially atomistic and separatistic. Its endless distractions, its selfishness and narrow-mindedness make it unfit for the successful evangelization and Christianization of the world, and unfit also for the thorough Christian education of the American youth. Its ultimate consequences will be Rationalism and infidelity.

3. The main tendency of the times is toward Rationalism and infidelity. Our free school education is essentially rationalistic. A great many ministers and lay-members of our Churches, accommodating themselves to the *isms* of the times, unconsciously move in this direction. For popularity's sake, they sail with the current, instead of stemming it.

4. Neither Rationalism, nor unchurchly piety can save us from a relapse into the snares of Popery; for history proves that weary Rationalists and weary enthusiasts have sought firmness and rest in the stability of the Roman Catholic system.

5. Evangelical Protestantism, in avoiding the Scylla of mere petrified Churchism, has also to avoid the Charybdis of unchurchly subjectivism, for both of these extremes prove the grave of sound and vital Christianity.

6. We have no reason to be afraid of the future. Christ, the living Head of the Church, will never abandon His people. He has in all ages, led His bride, the Church, safely through all

the stormy waters of error and persecution; she has ever come out of them stronger and brighter than before. He will also bring light into the chaos of *our* time. But surely ours is no time to sleep or thoughtlessly swim with the current, but to watch and to pray, and faithfully and understandingly labor for the welfare of Zion; for great changes, and, consequently, great trials and temptations are at hand. In such times we can have, outside the Holy Scriptures, no better guide than the past history of the Church.

Art. VII.—INFIDELITY.

BY REV. D. GANS, D.D.

The "signs of the times" would certainly constitute a prolific subject of discourse for the present. At no former period were they perhaps more numerous, and surely never more significant. By their variety, they seem to comprehend every interest appertaining to the present, and in the way of prophecy they point far out into the future, indicating with great distinctness what shall be many years hence.

Into the present, the past seems to have crowded all its vital elements—good, bad and indifferent—moral, religious, civil and political—and these are now in a condition to enter into new combinations, and to be so modified as to direct their course and define their moral influence for the future.

History, like electricity from the clouds, generally moves in a straight line, until by its rapid motion it so condenses the atmosphere before it, as to be turned off in another direction, making thus a zig-zag descent to the earth. The present is that condensed point, and constitutes, therefore, clearly an epoch in the general current of our human life—a stepping stone to something higher, clearer and more closely allied to the ultimate destination of the race.

A great providential movement, we apprehend, is a short distance in advance of us—a movement which will vitally affect all the great social, political and religious interests of the world; and well will it be for the generations to come, if the present is faithful in properly moulding the elements at this turning point or transition period.

The moral aspect of the present period, may seem to indicate a retrograde motion on the part of history, but no single point in any age ought to constitute the ground of a judgment in relation to an interest so continuous, broad and varied as that of history. For the moment, things may seem to stand still—aye, even to move backwards, like the sun on the dial of Ahaz—but if you will wait until the great movement is over for which preparations were being made in the quiet of apparent inaction, you will be able to trace out a continuous and glorious advance. The waters of the Red Sea always give way, and God's people and God's interests generally, though they may halt for the moment, have occasion continually to raise the triumphal song of Moses and Miriam, and praise the Lord for His great deliverances. The darkest part of the night is always that which immediately precedes the dawn; and if it be true that the present is worse than former periods, we regard this truth as one of the significant signs pointing to our speedy deliverance.

But it is not my design (in this article) to dwell upon the "signs of the times" in general. This were too varied a theme for the limits to which we are confined. It is rather to select one of the darkest and most significant of these signs, and by a careful investigation, show its baseless character, and thus endeavor to secure the earnest mind against its aggressive and destructive influence. This, as indicated by the caption of this article, is *infidelity*.

It is perhaps unnecessary to s ay here, that this evil spirit under its various forms, is present in its great and withering power, in almost every department of life. There is domestic infidelity, and political infidelity; but these different forms of it are the results of religious infidelity, which, under its practical character, is seen everywhere to manifest greater boldness in the present, than it has for many years in the past.

Infidelity, it is true, can boast of greater antiquity, but gray hairs and many years are not always honorable. Sin and vice, of every kind, every shade, and every degree, which right-minded men have always abhorred and despised, come to us in hoary locks. They have left their mark on every age, even up to the youth of the world. Their age, instead of making them venerable, only exhibits them as the more exceeding sinful, and the more to be despised by man and cursed by the Almighty. Christianity, involving a positive faith, has always been accompanied by its negative in the various forms of unbelief.

Infidelity, thus born and baptized in sin, raised and nurtured in iniquity, descending with its original elements through all the various stages of history, itself the leading element in all bold transgressions which mark the past and the present, has never been permitted, at any period, to make the faith of God without effect. Though the Saviour of the world was constrained to marvel at its bold character, yet the great system of Redemption, like a deep and broad stream in the inner life of the world, continued calmly to flow on, imparting its divine benefits to every age; and thus, notwithstanding the threatening aspect of the present, the mighty stream will continue through all the future, without losing any of its efficient power; and when having put in motion all the great machinery of earth—having imparted light, heat, moisture, fertility and beauty to the globe—having inspired literature and science, and spread civilization and true religious, moral and civil freedom through all ranks and conditions of men—making thus the wilderness and solitary places to bloom and blossom as the rose, it will return again, with unexhausted strength and untarnished beauty into the broad bosom of Divinity, whence it rose.

Such is the nature of the great interest of God in the world, that no form of opposition, whether it be negative or positive, scientific or conceived in the credulity of ignorance, whether it pass out from a malicious design, or from an honest but deluded conscience, shall ever be able to destroy any essential element of its divine efficiency. What if some did not believe in the past? What if many do not believe in the present? And what

if still more should permit themselves to fall into the arms of infidelity in the future? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid.

By infidelity, we mean a general opposition to Christianity. It does not involve a denial of the being and existence of God. This is atheism. An atheist is an infidel, but an infidel, strictly speaking, cannot be an atheist. What infidelity admits atheism denies—namely, the existence of God. "It denies in common with atheism, the divine origin of Christianity" and repudiates the claims which it involves. It protests, not only against the Scriptures as containing a divine revelation, but also against the Church as embodying a divine life. These are the two great sides of Christianity, both claiming to be divine—the one existing in the form of substantial life or grace, and the other in the form of theory, the theory of that life or grace—the one completing the other. The divinity of both these is alike denied and discarded by the infidel, first, theoretically, and second, practically. Sometimes you see practical infidelity without any clearly formed objections of a theoretical character against Christianity, in which cases it implies great ignorance, spiritual stupidity and a degree of degraded moral feeling which can only be reached by long previous and thoughtless habit.

Our design with infidelity as thus defined, is not to trace it out in the different departments in which it exists, not to exhibit it as one of the present age, nor yet to describe directly its evil influences: all this is well known and deeply mourned over by all truly great and good men; but to show if possible, the difficulties of infidelity as a system—its defective character to satisfy the wants of our nature, or to meet the necessities of the age in any view, and thus help, as much as in us lies, to root up its foundation. We would meet the infidel on his own ground, and with him, first of all, calmly and dispassionately consider the *sources* of infidelity. What are the principal sources from which infidels of every school have professed, and do still profess to draw the great foundation principles of their system of unbelief? All concede that these sources are limited to

three; first, Reason, second, Nature, third, Conscience. These, they say, separately or jointly, are sufficient to enable man to meet the design of God and to satisfy the spiritual necessities of his nature; and hence the Bible on the one hand, and the Church on the other, are denied and repudiated.

First, let us look at *Reason* in its relation to spiritual things.

No one, we may here say with truth, is in a condition to make more real account of reason, than the true Christian. No one can regard it in a higher light, invest it with more noble attributes, or make a greater boast of it, than he. The Christian is free to accede candidly to all that the infidel may claim for it, but only when the reason is in its original state, true sphere, and under its proper and legitimate influences. Infidelity says, that reason, as we now find it, is sufficient, independent of revelation, to guide man properly in his relation to God, to himself, and to his fellow-men. Christianity says, that reason is a godlike endowment, and in its original state, pure and luminous as when it came from the Divine hand, it was equal to this duty; for then the heart being pure, God dwelt among men and spake to them face to face, and reason was the medium through which the spiritual light was revealed, the mirror by which the heavenly was reflected.

But now the simple question is, Is reason, at the present, in its original state? Do the same spiritual features attach to it now under the same influences as then?

Infidelity acknowledges the fall of man, and the entrance of the principle of evil. It owns the presence of a depraved nature, wrong tendencies, a perverted state of the will and of the affections, because all these things enter into our experience, and experience the infidel claims as one of his greatest arguments against Christianity. He must therefore acknowledge it here, as well as claim it elsewhere. In acknowledging the principle of experience, he must own the presence of sin, because the first involves the last. But now this moral change of our nature being acknowledged by the infidel on the ground of experience, we ask, what right has he, or any one, to assume that the reason is a safe and sufficient guide at the present, and under its present

abnormal and unnatural circumstances? Because the reason was competent to a certain given duty when in a particular state and under peculiar circumstances, does certainly not prove that it would be equal to the same duty, this state and these circumstances being radically changed.

Here is a difficulty lying at the very threshold of the whole system, based upon the sufficiency of reason, which the infidel has never yet satisfactorily met and disposed of. The only way in which he can get rid of the difficulty is by proving, on strictly philosophical principles, that there is such a divorce between the reason, strictly so called, and the affections or the moral feelings, as to exclude all vital contact; then the result may follow, that the affections may be completely perverted and depraved, whilst the reason, as such, may continue in its original state of clearness, innocence and purity.

But here we make our appeal to reason itself, and ask can this be? Can such a divorce exist in an organic being? Reason cannot answer yes, to a thing which is unreasonable in its very nature. We cannot so split man's being, into two halves, as to justify us in regarding one half as fallen and corrupt, and the other as still existing in its original integrity and purity. Such a thought is simply absurd. No part of a plant can be so separated from every other part that the plant itself will not be vitally affected by it; and yet the constitution of the plant is no more really organic than that of our own being. Man is a unit throughout, indissoluble but by death, and on this account, no single part can be affected without involving more or less his whole being, body, soul and spirit. Such a dualism between the reason and the moral feelings is inconsistent with science and philosophy, and reason itself and all analogy declare it to be false and groundless. To believe even in the possibility of it in the case of a real living man, would require a greater amount of faith, or rather credulity, than Christianity has ever demanded.

Now if Infidelity cannot prove the truth of this dualism between the reason and the affections, then the old difficulty recurs with all its force. How can the affections be depraved

without communicating that depravity to the reason? Is therefore the reason in its original, pure state? It cannot be, feeling as we must, on the principle of experience, the derangement of the affections. And if the reason *has* changed and become corrupt with the feelings, what right has any one to set it up as an infallible guide in spiritual and eternal things? On what principle should the reason, in this view, be looked upon as a safer guide in its department, than the depraved feelings are in theirs?

Besides this—if the infidel were able fully and conclusively to prove this divorce of the reason from the affections, what would he gain in favor of his system? What would be the use of the infallible reason as a guide, when it does not stand in such relation to the affections or to the other part of our being in general, as to influence and lead them in the path which it might indicate? This would be like the relation of a sound and healthy will to a paralyzed arm. What would the healthy condition of the will help in such a case? Could it give vigor and motion to the arm? What, therefore, would be the gain even to admit that the reason is an infallible guide, if it is so divorced from the affections that it cannot govern these? It must be clear, that, if the reason has preserved its purity, it has done so under such a form as to render it practically useless, so far as the original design of it is concerned. Let the infidel then take whichever horn of the dilemma he may choose, and the difficulty will remain and be the same in substance and as unyielding in character.

Reason, then, we conclude from the difficulty suggested by its own nature and condition, is not a competent guide in relation to things spiritual and divine. Limited by its original constitution, and carnalized by its lapse into sin, it can never so penetrate the deep things of God and the complicated relations we sustain to Him by creation and especially by the great system of grace, as to lead us safely through the present darkness, to the true light—the highest end of our being.

From every true investigation of the nature and original elements of the reason, the conclusion follows with irresistible

necessity, that *faith* was its leading feature; and this is the reason why, in its primary condition, it was competent to meet and fulfil the spiritual purposes of God in reference to man. Its innate and original limitation was thus counteracted, and it was qualified by its nature, united with faith, to take in the conception of the infinite, and to understand the spiritual. Reason and faith do not exclude each other, as light and darkness, but penetrate each other as in the case of two substances in a true chemical compound, and mutually act upon each other, as soul and body—the one completing the other. Faith is the soul of reason and its highest glory; and as when the soul is separated, the body dies, so when faith, by reason of sin, was divorced from the understanding, it died to all the higher and spiritual realities with which it was originally conversant. To reason without faith is to be infidel, just as really so, as to believe without reason is to be credulous and fanatic. The two were bound together by original creation, and have therefore a natural affinity for each other; and what God has thus united may not, without the most serious detriment to our well doing, be torn asunder.

What were thus separated by sin, it is the design now of Christianity again to re-unite. Hence Christianity is so frequently called the *new creation*. The reason, by the fall, has not lost its capacity for faith—its throne and image are still in the reason, though the beautiful queen has fled.

Reason and natural faith (which is the abiding type of the spiritual) are even now always united in every healthful action of the mind, in reference to the objects of the present world. You see, for instance, a seed placed into the ground; presently it puts forth its roots, then its stem, then its branches, leaves, blossoms, and finally its fruit: but can you see the power that works in it, the law that pervades it producing all these changes, and which in the midst of them all, preserves its species as an individual plant, differing from all other plants? And what does the naturalist do when by reason he is thus led to the boundary of reason, with the plain evidence before him, that beyond this there lies an all persuasive power? Does he deny

this power or law, simply because he cannot seize it, demonstrate it, or analyze it by his reason? No; but he *believes* it! Does not the veriest infidel do so? If he do not, then he plainly denies the foundation of all science, even the most logically exact and scrupulously precise; for what tyro does not know that every science rests upon some given truth, as a basis, some axiom, which can neither be analyzed nor demonstrated, but which simply appeals to reason as such, and which the mind receives and endorses by the principle of natural faith. He, therefore, who denies that faith belongs legitimately to reason, denies at the same time the validity of every scientific conclusion, because the foundation of all science is simple belief or faith. From this basis arises the whole scientific superstructure, which has been the boast of infidels themselves of every age! How strange that the very weapons made use of by unbelief trace themselves back to faith, from which they receive all the authority and force which they possess!

Now infidelity, which denies the whole analogy of faith, as it lies in the ordinary, natural process of acquiring knowledge, simply proves itself to be unnatural, to be set against the very law and course of nature; and to be irrational also, for the very nature of reason implies and requires the pure lamp of faith to be suspended in the very centre of its being, illuminating its darkness, and enabling it to receive the spiritual, and understand that which lies beyond its natural but morally darkened powers. At this point we ask then, if reason is in its purely isolated state unsatisfactory in reference to the *carnal* things of the present life, how can it be competent in relation to spiritual things—the deep things of God and of the life to come? The conclusion is, that that only is true reason, which, feeling the great spiritual want, leads to the supply, the only competent guide, which is found in the kingdom of God—Jesus Christ the day-star, *τα παντα εν πασιν*, and His word, the lamp to our feet and a light to our path.

Second. The second source of infidelity is Nature—God's world, or the handiworks of the Almighty.

In regard to these things we may say, as we have already

said in reference to reason, that no one can admire them more highly, and make more account of them, as displaying the nature and laws of God, than the Christian. In what infidel book descriptive of nature can you find lines of praise, beautiful, graphic, all-comprehensive, like these: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiworks; day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night proclaimeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world."

Then in the new revelation you find the following: "For the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen by the things that are made, even His eternal power and godhead; so that they (even the heathen) are without excuse."

Has Paine, or Bolingbroke, or Hume, or Gibbon, or any other infidel writer, ancient or modern, ever composed a higher and more splendid eulogy on nature than this? Have all their high-wrought and elaborate descriptions of God's Handiworks—hailing nature as the great Bible or book of God—expatiating with learned pride upon its vastness, its unchangeable order, its perfect harmony, diversified drapery and gorgeous beauties—do all these combined enunciate to the praise of Nature and the glory of the Creator, the one thousandth part of what is comprehended in these few, simple, but unique lines? Infidelity would always do well to borrow from divine revelation, at least in this respect.

But the question now to be considered is, whether nature is a sufficient guide for man in his spiritual being and relations? In concluding upon this question, there are two things which must ever be before our minds. The first is, that reason, like the affections, as we have already seen, is in a perverted, depraved and darkened condition. This is the conclusion of every legitimate process of investigation, and is confirmed by experience, which the infidel cannot deny and yet claim respect consistently for what he regards as his strongest argument—the argument based upon experience. It is now with this depraved

and perverted reason that we approach the Handiworks of the Almighty, with a view to penetrate them, understand them, and extract the will of God from them. In view of this fact, the question is—not what the light of nature would be to a pure and sinless mind, or what the light of nature is in itself, but what it is to a mind which has lost its original virtue and become darkened and naturally inclined to that which is false and wrong.

The second fact which must carefully be borne in mind in deciding upon the capacity of nature to lead man with a perverted reason to proper conclusions in reference to the will of God and his own true destiny, is, the state of Nature itself. Is nature now in precisely the same condition as when it came from the hand of God? Has the sin which made such a deep and radical impression upon the world of mind, deranging every faculty, produced no change in the physical world? What mean those tares, and briers, and thorns, which grow spontaneously in every locality? What mean the earthquakes, pestilences and famine to which every quarter of the globe is witness? Natural science bears the most unequivocal testimony to the far-reaching and comprehensive truth of Revelation, when it thus declares: "The whole creation, groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." It is clear therefore, without going any further into the subject at this point, that nature itself is diseased, and does not sustain the same relation to the spiritual which it at first sustained, when it came pure and luminous from the hand of God; nor can it therefore be capable of guiding the spirit of man now, as it was then. Nature, as in the case of the second temple erected at Jerusalem after the captivity, has lost its true glory in this view. No voice now sounds from behind the veil, as in ancient times, to acquaint men in a certain and authoritative way with the will of heaven. The shekinah has disappeared because of sin, and the oracle is separated from its guiding wisdom and its true divine glory. Silence and darkness now reign together through all the handiworks of God.

Here then are plainly two facts growing out of experience and

confirmed by the discovery of science itself, which show that both reason and nature are in a very different condition now from what they were in the beginning. In view of this great and radical change, have we any right, on the ground of science, or from any other view of the case, to affirm that that which was sufficient to guide man in the beginning or prior to the change, is sufficient now or after the change? Plainly, this would be to make no account of the change at all.

But let us bring the case to a more practical issue. If it is still contended that nature is competent to this great task, then it must follow that nature must utter the same voice in all localities, speak the same language to every people, and everywhere teach the same fundamental lessons to all who apply to it for instruction. God's will is one and the same everywhere, and nature must teach the same general principles to all minds in an infallible manner. This is what we claim for Revelation in its proper condition, and is a fair test of the claims of anything that professes to take the place of Revelation and accomplish the ends which it proposes.

Let now any one become conversant with the different systems, as they are called, of infidelity, which are professedly based upon nature, examine them for himself, and see whether, to the infidel mind, nature has invariably spoken the same things. These systems contain anything but *harmony*. If time permitted, we should take pleasure in showing the discrepancies and radical contradictions, from the books, which abound in every direction and upon every subject. Look back upon the ancient world and down through the deep darkness of Heathenism, and do the things which you there discover, prove that nature is sufficient to guide man, independent of revelation? On the supposition that it is—how do you account for heathenism at all? Nature, objectively, is to the heathen world the same as it is to the Christian; it is just as majestic and glorious; it is just as wonderfully diversified; and why, if nature is sufficient, are the people lapsed into such gross mental and moral darkness?

We cannot here argue that there is any deficiency in the way

of original mental endowment between the heathen and the Christian mind. Look at the great Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Socrates and Cicero. Were they not individuals known to the world? Were they not the founders of the most distinguished schools of philosophy and general learning? And do they not even now hold a sway over the mind which even the wisdom of the nineteenth century cannot break, because it cannot rise superior to them; and yet these great mental prodigies were heathen, struggling with a corrupt nature which they could not understand, and depressed by a moral gloom which they could not penetrate. Will the infidel tell us how to account for all these things?

In regard to the question, What is the chief good? (the most fundamental of all questions) Cicero says, "there was so great a dissension among the philosophers, that it was almost impossible to enumerate their different sentiments. More than one hundred different opinions on this subject are gathered from their works."

Then look at their idolatry. They deified planets, reptiles, wood and stone.

From this, turn and look at their practices, which were defended and justified by their best men. Self-murder, hatred, revenge ,adultery, lying, theft, rapine and plunder—all these were defended in the broad light of Nature! Infidelity, what say you of the picture? It will not do to deny history, and here the account is given in the plainest possible terms. How emphatically true the stanza familiar to us all:—

> "Blind unbelief is sure to err,
> And scan God's works in vain:
> God is His own interpreter,
> And He must make it plain."

Take up any of the more modern systems of unbelief, which profess to receive their material from nature, those for instance, of Herbert and Hume, of Bolingbroke and Hobbes, of Spinoza and Paine—compare them together, and upon what great principle, save that of opposition to Christianity, do they agree?

The one affirms, and the other denies. What have you left in the way of positive truth, or even positive error? If you take their combined teaching, it is clear to perceive that nothing is left on which you might stand. The ultimate result of all false reasoning, is *negation*, and in no department is this result so clearly reached, as in that of infidelity. If you take the trouble to examine a goodly number of them together, you well find this fact fully verified, that there is not a single crime forbidden in the entire moral law, which does not find an advocate, though he may be contradicted by others, in some one of these various champions for the sufficiency of reason and nature. Now we ask in the name both of nature and reason, How can all this contradiction, contrariety and immorality, mirrored muddily in their own systems, be reconciled with the claim, that reason and nature are competent to the work of leading men in the right way, socially, morally and religiously?

Here it would be in place to advert to the moral character of those who advocate these and similar systems. Biography and history, in regard to this point, are full and decided; but propriety compels us to pass this point over in silence. Nature, therefore, has failed as a source of any system which denies revelation.

The *third* source claimed by the unbeliever the world over, is *conscience*. The infidel says that even if it could be shown that reason and nature were not sufficient, man could still fall back upon conscience, which being given by the Almighty for the express purpose of bearing witness to the truth, would itself be sufficient as a guide to him in relation to all things that pertain to time and eternity. Having this, he proudly asks—Why the Bible? It is important therefore that we learn the true nature and office of the conscience. It has been the habit of the infidel mind always, when it is driven from its other two strongholds upon which we have now briefly dwelt, to take refuge in the conscience; and this principally because the believer is accustomed to look upon it as being vested with the very highest authority for the soul. This resort always indicates a kind of begging the question, a disposition to make common

cause of the differences, to build its vague and inconsistent structure upon a foundation admitted by all. But we cannot allow the adversary, even in his most fatal necessity, to erect so human a system upon so divine a foundation; and the reason we will assign.

The conscience wrongly understood, may indeed at least seem to furnish a basis for the efforts of the infidel mind. But it is not difficult to detect the fallacy and expose the sophistry.

If conscience be regarded as an *intellectual* faculty in our being, actively originating thought, or as an intellectual judge, taking up the case in an original way and investigating and analyzing it independently of any other faculty or faculties, and then deciding upon the right and the wrong in the case, it might indeed be appealed to by the infidel in support of his theory. For if conscience, notwithstanding the fall and the consequent depravity of nature, has this intellectual character, is still always on the side of right and against wrong, in such a way as to know infallibly what is right, and what is wrong, it follows that it would be a safe guide, even though reason and nature should both fail.

But just here plainly lies the fallacy. Conscience is not reason—is not the mind, and does not belong to the galaxy of the intellect strictly speaking, at all. It belongs wholly to the moral department of our being strictly so defined, as distinguished from the intellectual. It has therefore nothing to do in determining the questions—intellectually: What is right? What is wrong? This is the work of the reason, or the intellect. This belongs to the analyzing power of the mind strictly so called. For this the intellect was given; this is its duty and mission in our being.

When the mind, properly so called, takes hold of any subject or matter involving morals, it investigates it, as the attorney does the facts in a case at law, and after the investigation is completed, it then makes a representation of them to the judge or conscience. The conscience then acts upon the *representation* which the mind has made. It knows nothing beyond this. This representation may be true, or it may be false, that

is, it may be a legitimate result of the facts which the mind had under investigation, or it may be a misrepresentation of those facts. The decision of conscience, therefore, upon the representation, is always in a hypothetical form. It says, if this be a correct representation, and if it be intellectually true, then it is right; if, however, it be incorrect and untrue, then it is wrong. Thus conscience is always on the side of right, so far as right is made known to it by the mind; for it is clearly dependent upon the mind, at every step, seeing that it can make no intellectual investigations of itself.

From this it is not difficult to see that the responsibility of the judgments of the conscience falls back directly upon the reason: and we have seen that the reason is darkened by sin and naturally prone to error. It may mistake in facts, and in the relation and connection of principles; and even knowing the whole truth, its moral perverseness may lead it to keep back a part for the very purpose of deceiving the conscience. Thus the mind may represent as truth to the conscience that which, in fact, is actually false. What will the conscience do in this case? What can it do but decide upon the representation, that it is true and good? In the same way, the mind may represent a thing to be false and wrong, whereas in fact, it may be true and right. The judgment of the conscience will be in accordance with the intellectual representation. Here are wrong and false judgments made by the conscience, because error was either designedly represented as truth, on the ground of which (and the conscience had no other ground) it decided. The fault is not in the conscience, but in the understanding and heart, which the conscience shows by reversing the judgment as soon as the error is detected. And whilst in the midst of this deception of the mind and heart, we are bound to obey our conscience, right or wrong, because we have within us no higher authority, we are equally bound (and this obligation precedes the other) so to guard the operations of our mind as to secure a correct and right conscience.

This shows the solemnity of the work of making up what are called our *opinions*. Nothing can well be of a more serious

nature, because they affect and mould the conscience. How carefully, in forming our opinions, should we guard against mere prejudice—mere desire that the truth should be thus or so—against all mere habit, which tends to lead us in one direction rather than in another—and to be open for truth itself.

The fact that conscience is no intellectual faculty and cannot therefore analyze and distinguish intellectually between the true and the false, the good and the evil, fully accounts for the different and contradictory decisions of conscience in different localities and under different circumstances. If it were an intellectual investigator and a moral judge at the same time, then it would follow, if its nature is to be always on the side of the right, that, in regard to the same thing, its judgments would always and everywhere be the same. But this is by no means the case, and simply because moral subjects are *intellectually* regarded and represented in very different lights. Men may be equally conscientious who stand on the opposite sides of moral questions. We see this every day of our lives. Why is this? Not certainly because the conscience of the one means to be with the truth, and that of the other means to be against it. They are both equally earnest and sincere, and conscience, in both cases alike, means to be on the side of truth. The reason, is that the truth is differently understood by the parties, and that the conscience is dependent upon this difference of understanding.

The Hindoos require self-immolation under the wheels of an idol's car. The South-Sea Islanders regard it as right to bury their aged parents alive, and put to death their infant children in the most inhuman and cruel manner. The ancient Spartans committed theft as a virtue, and highly extolled, and, sometimes even rewarded the shrewdness of him who could accomplish his thieving purposes without detection. Even the Apostle Paul, previous to his conversion, thought honestly that he was doing God service, when he was tearing down the Churches and destroying the followers of Christ.

Thus we might proceed through all the grades of Heathenism, and also through those of the nominally civilized and

Christianized countries, but where the standard of divine revelation is not set up and received *in fact*—showing that conscience is not the intellectual judge, but simply the approver or disapprover of things which the mind, after a serious investigation, represents to be either right or wrong, good or evil. Conscience is not the judge, deciding intellectually upon the right or wrong. This is the office of the reason. But conscience is the jury, which makes application of the law and the facts as it receives them from the reason and the understanding. Conscience cannot go beyond the representation of the mind, and upon the mind it is dependent for the true or false character of the judgments to which it may come.

This now being the true view of conscience, how does it affect the claims of infidelity? Simply thus:—it destroys its last refuge. For if conscience is thus dependent upon the reason, then it certainly cannot be a better guide *than* the reason. But reason itself is corrupted and depraved, as we have already seen; it leads to darkness and error rather than to light and truth. Where then is the solid foundation for infidelity? Reason has failed; Nature has failed; and Conscience has failed. Take these in their combined character, let them collect and concentrate all their strength and wisdom, and would it be possible for them to discover the grand system of grace by which God has proposed, in mercy, to bring our ruined race back to Himself, in which His justice is magnified, while the ungodly are justified? Nature, for the merely natural eye, has no trace of this, nor has the reason or the conscience. To what else will it appeal? Upon what else will it attempt to rear its system, to prove that God is no longer needed in the world? Behold the baseless fabric of a vision! It is grand only in its pretensions, hollow as the sepulchres of the dead, and no less offensive to true reason and sound moral judgment. Let it crumble to the earth, that, in its ruins, it may illustrate the pride and folly of mortals, who, receiving a faint spark of reason from the great fountain of all light and knowledge, goodness and truth, would then run away and declare itself to be the independent fountain of light!

The general conclusion, then, of this whole discussion, is, that two things, in our present darkened and depraved state, are absolutely necessary; first, a supernatural *light*, to enlighten the reason, and this we find in the Scriptures of divine inspiration, which are infallible in all their teaching; and second, a supernatural *grace*, to change the heart, and create the principle of divine love or moral sympathy with the character of God, which is the substantial basis of all true knowledge of spiritual things, and this we find in the Church, which is the Body of Christ.

We had intended, at this point, with a view to illustrate still more fully the baseless character of infidelity, to advert to the origin of Christianity—its nature and the circumstances which attended its birth into the world—the fact that it occurred just at a time when the mind was most painfully awake and best qualified to judge of its true character—the fact that it was received and endorsed by the world—that it calmed the great heart of the world as nothing else could calm it, and that it constituted the great turning point in history, modifying and conditioning every form of life and activity since that time; but we find that, for want of time, this simple annunciation of the argument, is all that can be given at the present.

A few remarks upon the comparative superiority of those countries which enjoy the institutions of the gospel, over those which have been overrun by the principles of unbelief, and we shall close.

As types of all the rest, we here point to France and England. We must here stop to premise that we do not now refer to Catholic France; for whatever other charges might, by the Protestant mind, be brought against France in this view, it would not be possible to bring that of unbelief or infidelity. Nor do we refer to Protestant France, properly so called, for here too is faith, and faith, at different points in her history, of a very earnest and vigorous character. We refer to infidel France—to France as she fell at different times under the practical power of an infidel principle—as she enthroned Reason as her goddess, at whose shrine she then bowed, and discarded the

sacred authority of Christianity—deriding its claims and mocking its great Founder, Jesus Christ.

Look at France under this view in her eventful history. Like the restless tide, she has experienced a perpetual ebb and flow. For the moment, peace would steal over her surface, like the calm and gentle breeze of evening over the great deep, and almost before she has had time to enjoy its holy pleasure, her nerves would begin to twitch in every part of her body politic, which would continue and increase until her whole system would lie prostrate in the severe spasm of revolution. To see her deep throes and throbs only sketched by the hand of history, is enough to induce a shudder in the breast of every true philanthropist and patriot. Contemplate her licentiousness and cruelty; her divorces of the sacred marriage tie and degradation of woman; her murders and cruel wrongs; her reign of despotism with her reign of Reason, and what human heart will not turn away from the picture with the sincere prayer: Oh God, pity and have mercy upon the weakness and folly of humanity!

And why all this? Simply, if not solely, because Christianity was ignored, and infidelity, boastfully grounded upon Reason, was inaugurated in its stead. History here speaks like the mother to the child, in the most simple and unadorned language. He that runs may read, and he that reads may fully understand.

Now, compare this dark picture with that presented in England, or any other country, at the same period, where the Christian church was honored and where the Bible was allowed to speak its own beautiful, simple, heavenly language. How different the general aspect! How calm and peaceful the great heart of the nation! How prosperous in all the intellectual, social, and civil enterprises, that spread happiness, stability, and plenty through all the departments of life, uniting the nation in one great soul, and causing each to say feelingly—I am proud to be an Englishman! Passing from the one country into the other, in any of these characteristic periods or epochs, is like passing from the storm and the earthquake into the calm

and gentle breeze which is felt at the opening of day, or when the sun retires—soothing, stilling, yet inspiring—lifting the soul to God and the undimmed beauties of Heaven.

Now, why the difference? Let the unbeliever, taking the lamp of experience for his guide, explain why it is.

The same great difference, described and illustrated by history, runs through all the veins of a nation's life. Admit Christianity into the heart of a nation in the form of a divine institution, bearing with it the elements of spiritual life and grace for the heart, and that nation has an anchor which will hold it firm and steady amid all the storms of revolution, and cause it to result only in reformation, cleansing its impurity and restoring its excellencies. Let the Holy Bible—the divinely compressed book of gems—which is literally a compound of magnificence above all order—let this divine volume, in the bosom of the Christian church, be uplifted as the standard of doctrine and the source of morals, and that nation is safe, prosperous, united, and happy, beyond the power of any human agency to make it otherwise. The Bible, we are aware, requires our obedience, and not our eulogy. We cannot paint the rose, nor add beauty to the lily. The Bible stands unique, rich in its own charms, defying the world in all its boasted wisdom, either to add to or take from it. It passes through every age as the sun passes through the circle of every day, the true glory of the world.

The celebrated Scaliger was so enraptured with its high intellectual and chaste classical merit, as to be led to say on one occasion, that he would rather have been the author of the single stanza, in the 18th Psalm, rendered by Sternhold and Hopkins:

> On Cherub, and on Cherubim,
> Full royally he rode;
> And on the wings of mighty winds,
> Came flying all abroad,

than to have possessed and enjoyed the Kingdom of Arragon.

In view, now, of the radical insufficiency, of the sources of infidelity, and in view, still further, of the historical testimony

in favor of Christianity and against unbelief, at which, for the present, we can cast but a glance, all which is ample and clear, we must be permitted here to say, that it requires something of boldness, not to intimate a more debasing disposition, and a degree of ignorance and carnal stupidity not often found in this land, for any individual calmly and deliberately to rise up and say, that Christianity is an imposition, and the Bible a cunningly devised fable. It would be to say *raca* to all the world before him, and very modestly to claim for himself all the wisdom. In one thing such an one surely is not wise, and that is, in the knowledge of himself. However reluctantly it may be, yet, as regards the matter of his own wisdom, he will be constrained to concede, that the world around him, if not the venerated and hoary past, knows more than he; and if it, with this advantage, should, accidentally, call him a *madman*, the odds certainly would be very considerable; nor should he take it as unkind, or as involving, in any way, a breach of true gentility.

We close by adverting to the *practical* confirmation of all that has now been said. What is it that meets the deeply-felt spiritual necessities of every soul, like Christianity? Just as, at its humble birth in Bethlehem, it satisfied the restless longings of all the past, being its complete fulfillment, and sent lively currents of joy even to the utmost borders of our common humanity, so does it now fully satisfy the deepest wants of every individual who applies to it. Christianity embraced, expels fear, allays every apprehension of the future, calms the soul in the midst of the greatest throes of nature, and causes the sunbeams of joy and happiness to spread all through the moral being. This has been, and this is, the experience of thousands. How will infidelity, running in the face of its own darling principle—experience—explain away what thousands have and do still experience? As well, surely, might he seek to deny his image reflected from the placid water.

The Christian is composed and resigned even when he feels that, because of disease, his sands of life are almost exhausted. He calmly approaches his end, and the nearer he approximates

it, like the fond father returning to his loved home, the more ardently does he rejoice, while the prayer goes up, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

Does infidelity thus prepare any soul to exchange worlds? Would you hear the last words of a few? Then listen that you may hear, and hearing, understand the hollowness of infidelity.

Francis Newport, when death was in view, looking towards the fire burning in his chamber, said: "Oh that I was to lie and broil upon that fire for a hundred thousand years, to purchase the favor of God, to be reconciled to Him again. But it is fruitless—vain wish; millions of millions of years will bring me no nearer to the end of my tortures, than one poor hour. Oh, Eternity! Eternity! who can properly paraphrase upon the words—forever and ever!"

Voltaire, the hero of modern infidelity, in his last illness, seeing the doctor approaching him, exclaimed in deep agony: "I am abandoned of God and man. Doctor, I will give you half of what I am worth, if you will give me six months' life." The doctor answered: "Sir, you cannot live six weeks." Voltaire replied: "Then I shall go to hell, and you will go with me;" and soon after he expired.

Hobbes, being informed that his end was near at hand, said: "I shall be glad, then, to find a hole to creep out of the world at."

Altamont, the noble, when dying, seeing the minister approach him, said: "You have come too late; I have neither life nor hope." "Heaven," said the minister, "is merciful." "Or," replied the dying man, "I could not have been thus guilty. What has it not done to bless and save me? I have been too strong for Omnipotence; I plucked down ruin." "Redeemer" fell from the minister's lips. He started—his eyes rolled wildly. "Hold! hold!" he cried in deep agony; "you wound me—this is the rock on which I split. I denied His name."

Now, contrast this seriously with the dying language of the Christian, and then tell me is infidelity worthy to take the place

of Christianity. Hear it, as it comes back from the departing spirit, clothed in the garments of salvation and pinioned for Heaven; "O, death, where is thy sting? O, grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law; but thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Every fact, therefore, within the sphere of our observation in the physical world, in the moral relations of men, and in the history of nations and of the human race, is a proof of man's dependence upon God, and of the fact that his true well-being can be promoted only to the extent that he voluntarily, through faith and a pious mind, casts himself upon the Divine Being. Man is a creature of law, hemmed in with relations on all hands, which are but the expressions of the Divine will, and which constantly refer to and condition him, physically, intellectually, and morally; and out of which, and beyond which he can no more exist and prosper and attain true happiness under any view, than he can breathe without the atmosphere, swim without water, or walk without a solid, sustaining substance. And as the proof is overwhelming of man's natural insufficiency, and of the *natural* provisions made by the Divine will to control and aid him, so, and no less strong and abundant are the evidences that in Christianity God has made *supernatural* provisions for man's elevation, enlightenment, and transformation, so that he can—not without, but with Divine aid—not in reliance, in the spirit of infidelity, upon the natural, but in reliance in the spirit of faith and purity upon the supernatural and Divine provisions, attain his true and highest end.

Art. VIII.—THE CHURCH IN HISTORY.

BY REV. G. DERING WOLFF, A. M.

Going back to the days of our Saviour's personal presence on the earth, a short time before His ascension, we behold Him standing on a mountain in Galilee, with His eleven disciples. We hear Him give to them their commission: "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you: and lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen!" This was their commission. It involved nothing less than the complete transformation of the world,—the removal of all existing prejudices, the overthrow of every existing form of religion, of every school of philosophy, and of every political institution, founded on the false principles which then interpenetrated the whole social structure, and, still more, the total destruction of sin under every form, and the substitution of holiness in its place.

Consider the time and circumstances under which this mighty work was to be commenced. It was not at a time when the influential nations of the earth, and those upon whom they had stamped the type of their own ideas, considered themselves rude and ignorant,—when they had not as yet made any investigations into the fundamental principles of individual action and of their social institutions, and when therefore, under a consciousness of their own intellectual and moral deficiencies, they were ready to receive instruction and rebuke. Nothing of the kind. "It was an age of boasted civilization, of culture, of politeness, of grandeur. Poets, orators, painters, and sculptors then lived, who have never since been equalled." There was

all the pride of power, of governments, the weight of whose authority extended over vast portions of the earth's surface, whose polity was looked upon as wise and equitable, whose laws were respected, whose machinery worked efficiently into the most remote provinces, and the right of whose citizenship was prized as a most precious possession. There was all the softness of luxury, all the refinements of cultivated taste, all the intellectual acuteness and activity which philosophic schools could give, conducted and sustained by men whose extraordinary powers of thought cause them to be regarded, to this day, as masters of dialectic skill. Men were then as proud of the civilization of their age, as men now are of the civilization of this age. They boasted, then, of their learning, their artistic triumphs, their philosophic attainments, as they now do.

As for their religions, all the power of philosophy, and all the adornments which art and music, and poetry could give, were exhausted in rendering them attractive. Their temples were models of beauty, and their ceremonies were as imposing and impressive as cultivated taste and judgment could render them. In the solemn processions and worship, were to be found the statesman and the soldier, the old man venerable with his silvered hair, the matron admirable in her chaste beauty and womanly grace, and white-robed and white-armed virgins, like opening rose-buds, just blushing into womanhood. Poesy embodied their religious legends, in language which to this day is looked to as examples of graceful composition. Their religious feelings were strengthened by patriotic associations. With them were connected their national history, their progress in arts, their social improvement, their reverses in war, their conquests and triumphs.

These remarks hold good, to a greater or less degree, in regard to all the nations of those times, but particularly so in regard to those two, which had stamped upon all the rest the type of their own characters and civilization—the Greek and the Roman. The first, fickle by nature, changing from day to-day, imaginative, versatile and fanciful, stood at the head of the human race in philosophy, poetry, eloquence, and art. The

latter, constant and unchanging, by instinct a venerator of the past, abhorrent of all novelty, the representative of law, of order, of stability,—to whom the state was all, the individual nothing,—a people above all others of enduring patience, of constant faith, of untiring energy, of unmovable fixedness of purpose—ever living in their recollections of the past, proud of what they had done and strong in the conviction of what they still could do, ever striving to actualize and excel the past in the present and the future,—despising all things pertaining to other nations, proudly and haughtily adherent to their own.

This was the world which our Saviour sent forth those eleven men to conquer—to more than conquer, to transform. Out of the infinite divisions of races, of peoples, of tongues, and the infinite varieties of climates, of customs and of ideas, in the midst of the darkness of pride, of false philosophy, of wrong intellectual culture, of luxury and all its attendant vices, they were to create a new people—unlike all others, different from all, opposed to all in every essential respect, and especially in those respects, in regard to which it is most difficult to change mankind;—a people, which though divided in a thousand ways, should yet be *one*, bound together by the attraction of *one* common centre, having one faith, acknowledging *one* LORD, receiving *one* BAPTISM, working *through* and ruled by one organization, and government, THE CHURCH.

Consider now the *locality* whence the efforts to accomplish all this were to emanate. Not from a country superior to all those which we have mentioned, in the prestige of military skill, of science, or of excellent civil polity—not from a people looked up to with admiration, on account of their intelligence, culture, or prosperity; nor yet from a country in close communication with other portions of the earth, whence intercourse would be easy, and movements emanating thence would rapidly extend themselves; but from a "land (to use the words of an eloquent divine) bounded on the west by the waters of the Mediterranean Sea, across which it sent not a single ship, on the east by mountains and deserts over which no caravan from this land

passed. On the north and south were hostile neighbors ever to be avoided."

"The people of this land claimed an old history, dating back some two thousand years, the rehearsal of which was an insult and a menace to all other nations. The people of this land spoke a rude and unpolished language of the olden times; their religion was repulsive for its austerity, and its ceremonies were despised. It was the land of Judea—a fossil land—a mock and a gibe among the nations—and in Judea men spoke with contempt of its rudest port, Galilee."

By the sandy beach of the sea of Galilee under the towering mountains which overshadowed it, stood the Saviour with this little band of poor, unlettered, obscure fishermen and publicans, the despised even of a despised nation, followers of a man rejected by His own countrymen, and put to death upon a Roman gibbet as a malefactor and impostor. Giving to them their commission, He sent them forth to a work far more difficult than to remove the mountains, under which they stood—mountains of prejudice, of passion, of unbelief, of wickedness towering higher than those mountains of Galilee, mountains rooted in the pride of human intellect and power, in the force of human habit, and of human vices, more deeply, than were those Galilean mountains in the foundations of the earth. What was the result? Let history reply.

Those men went forth with *faith*. Commencing at Jerusalem they passed into all the provinces of Asia Minor; into Greece, the home of arts, of science, of philosophy; to Egypt, the repository of occult mysteries, of the hidden secrets of knowledge; to Rome, the capital of Italy, of the civilized world, the source of law and authority, the seat of government and the centre of power. Their voices were heard in the islands of the Mediterranean, in Macedonia, Pamphylia, Phrygia, Arabia, and Scythia, as well as in the marts of Tyre and Smyrna, and the philosophic schools of Athens, Antioch, Ephesus, and Alexandria. They penetrated, in the one direction, to the banks of the Indus and the Ganges, in the other to the shores of the Atlantic ocean.

Thus they went forth into all lands, speaking in foreign tongues and strange accents, ever preaching Christ crucified, to the Greeks foolishness, to the Jews a stumbling-block, to the Romans,—both foolishness in the light of their philosophy, a stumbling-block as contradicting all their national associations and self-love; meeting face to face the polish, and eloquence, and intellectual vigor of Greece, and Egypt, and Italy; meeting sages, philosophers, orators, poets; they went forth preaching the deep mysteries of the revelation, comprehended in Christ; calling on men to give up all their philosophic speculations, all their beautiful mythology, to cast away all their poetical ideas and images, so dear to the oriental mind, and to receive, instead, the seemingly unreasonable and unphilosophical mysteries of this new teaching; and in place of their national gods, to worship as the one, only, true God—a person who, as a man, even in their own day, had walked on the earth, had been suspected, reviled, hated, and crucified by the officers of a Roman province. They called on them to give up their passions, the habits of years, that were sanctioned by public opinion; to practice charity and humility, instead of selfishness and pride; chastity and purity instead of licentiousness; and, in a word, to conquer themselves; to achieve the most difficult of all victories—victory over self.

This was their work. If they succeeded, would it not be accomplishing what, to all human judgment, was an impossibility? Think of the obstacles in the way of success. They found strong opposition on the part of men bound to their passions, on the part of the heathen priesthood, on the part of men who loved their country, and who upheld with obstinacy their religious customs and mythologies, intertwined as they were with their country's history, and its ancient glories.

Nor had Satan, the enemy of Christ, lost his skill or cunning. Nor did he relax his fell purpose to withstand the truth. Seizing on all the influences of national pride, of intellectual eminence, of philosophical prejudices, of selfish interests, he

combined them in the hands of the Roman emperor. Then the days of persecution fell upon the Church.

The Apostles were treated as conspirators against the peace of society and the established institutions of the State. They were imprisoned, were scourged, stoned, and crucified. Of the twelve but one escaped a violent death, and he only by a miracle. These first martyrs passed away, but their work ceased not. They had trained up St. Titus, St. Timothy, St. Mark, St. Luke, St. Clement, St. Linus, and many others, and to them and their fellow-laborers they entrusted the work. These labored in faith, meeting a like treatment with their predecessors at the hands of persecutors. The arches of the Coliseum often rang with the shouts of exulting thousands as wild beasts tore them to pieces and drank their life-blood. They were followed by others still faithfully striving to do the work assigned to them by their Divine Master, patiently enduring, like those who had gone before, hatred, contumely, suffering, and death. Of the *first thirty-one bishops of Rome*, *twenty-seven* sealed their faith with their blood. Thus the work of Christ went on, and the work of persecution kept even pace. If at times the sword of the Roman emperor was still, it was only that the wearied arm might regain its strength. The day had come when "the brother betrayed the brother to death, and the father the son; and children rose up against their parents, and caused them to be put to death."

But the faith of these Christians did not fail. They sought refuge in the dens and caves of the earth, when their persecutors pursued them too closely. In the Catacombs of Rome they erected their altars, and went out thence to make converts. In the dark recesses of those Catacombs we have evidences to this day of their endurance, their faith, and their worship, in the monuments, the pictures and sculpture, and inscriptions, which still remain. There, in the ordinance of Holy Baptism, they subjected the new-born babe to the washing of regeneration; there they gave the grace of Confirmation to the catechumen; there they received the Holy Communion of the body and

blood of Christ; and there, when life departed, their bodies were "deposited"—reverently *laid away*, to await the resurrection of the dead.

Thus the earnest and unequal struggle went on for three hundred years. On the one side were human learning, human culture, human prejudices, passion, and vices, old established institutions, laws, civil and military and ecclesiastical powers, all combined in deadly opposition, guided by Satanic cunning, aided by Satanic strength. On the other, twelve Apostles of a despised malefactor, and their equally despised followers.

What was the result? Did the mountains refuse to move? Were the obstacles the Christians encountered invincible? In the power of that faith, which was like a grain of mustard seed, they labored, they endured, they fought—and victory crowned their cause. The words of Christ were fulfilled. The "mountains" obeyed them. "Nothing" was "impossible" to them. Even the learning of the times yielded. "The pallium of the philosopher fell in graceful folds from the shoulders of many a Christian convert." The world, in wonder, beheld such men as Cyril, of Alexandria, and Origen, preëminent in philosophy and science, as well as in faith and piety. The faith of Christ triumphed everywhere, so that the Christian apologist might say with truth "There is no nation, or state, or city or people where Christianity has not been preached. We are but as yesterday, yet are we found in the courts, in the palace, in the armies, in the navies, in the fields, everywhere—save in the heathen temples, which are fast becoming deserted. Heathenism passed away. The Roman emperor himself—he who occupied the seat of the Cæsars, and was worshiped as a god—bowed before the crucified Lord, and proclaimed himself a Christian; and that cross which broke resplendent from the clouds upon the eyes of Constantine and his soldiers, enwreathed with letters of light—*In hoc signo vinces*—shone forth in the rays of the sun, as they fell upon the Roman capitol; *In hoc signo vinces*—a motto we might well adopt in this, our day. By *this* sign, by the *cross*, thou shalt conquer. It was displayed in the seat and centre of heathen power, on the banner of every Roman

Legion. Christianity had triumphed—triumphed over false philosophy, pride, passion, the force of old habits, the vices of men, the pride of power—over everything that stood in its way.

The mountains were removed. But was the work of Christians fully done? Did Satan abandon the struggle? Did the gates of hell no longer strive to prevail? Ah, no. The struggle continued, though under another form. In receiving into her bosom, those who had lived under the influence of heathen thought, and heathen customs, the Church necessarily admitted persons who were weak in faith, and imperfect in Christian knowledge and nurture. "The effect of this was first seen in laxity of manners, in ambition, in the loss of Christian virtue and fervor. The Church had to struggle against these encroachments of vice. Then was she beheld resisting them on all sides, preaching the stern precepts of divine morality, reproving in season and out of season, doing everything to lead men back to purity and innocence before God."

And, that the world might behold the *heroism of virtue*, in those days of luxury, of ease, of refinement, there were raised up in the bosom of the Church *whole orders* of holy anchorites,—the monks and ascetics of early times, who devoted themselves to lives of devout contemplation, of prayer, of self-denial, of labor—living protests against self-indulgence—beacon lights from which men might learn to be in the world, and yet not of it.

Many now are inclined to sneer at the rigid austerity and self-denial of those holy men—to look upon them as foolish enthusiasts. They were indeed enthusiasts, and it would be well for those, who thus sneer, to have some of their enthusiasm. They were fools, as Paul was, for Christ's sake—and their foolishness was the means of converting thousands to the truth.

But there was still another difficulty in the way of Christian progress. Heresies sprang up. Satan strove to lead men into the by-paths of error. Then did the Church call together her Bishops in council, even, as in the days of the Apostles, she did at Jerusalem. Thus, for example, at Nice, where the heresy of

Arius—denying the divinity of the Saviour, was to be encountered, and overcome; so also at Ephesus, at Constantinople, at Chalcedon. She encountered the heresies which threatened to dim her faith—and by her authoritative voice, pronounced, in the fulness of her faith, in the promises of Christ, of His presence, and of the gifts and guidance of the Holy Spirit, she overcame those heresies. There was no indecision, no compromising of the truth. She expelled from her bosom the heretical, schismatical tendencies—as our Saviour drove out the demons, from those who were possessed. She *had* FAITH—and by the power of that faith, she *removed* the *mountains* of heresy, which were in her way—and kept the truth delivered to the saints, pure for its transmission to our age.

That we may more fully realize the work done in those first three centuries after the Ascension of our Saviour, let us recall to mind the fact, that in that time was established and defined every fundamental doctrine of our Holy Religion. To that age, to the faith of *that* age, we owe our Holy Apostolic Creed, the Nicene Creed, and a little later, the Athanasian Creed.

And now what facilities had the Church to aid her in her mighty work? Had she Bible and Tract Societies, religious newspapers and periodicals—printing presses and colporteurs? Nothing of the kind. She had associations of pious and holy men. She had *no Bible*, much less the means of disseminating it. In those days the Church had not determined in what the Bible consisted. Her most pious, most learned, and most saintly men, differed among themselves, as to what constituted the sacred Scriptures. They quoted the writings of St. Ireneus, St. Polycarp, St. Clement, and others, as of equal authority with those of St. Luke, and St. John. Not only private laymen, but the higher Clergy, the Bishops, and whole provinces of churches did not possess all the books which now compose the sacred Scriptures. One Church had the Gospel according to St. Matthew, but was destitute of all the other Gospels; another that of St. Mark; another of St. Luke. So with the Epistles.

Any town of five thousand inhabitants in the United States has, to-day, I doubt not, a greater number of full and com-

plete copies of the Sacred Scriptures, than the whole Italian, or Egyptian, or Asiatic Church, had of any of the separate books which now form the Bible. They had no facilities for traveling, or disseminating knowledge. The seas swarmed with pirates—the land with robbers. A journey from Italy to Spain involved more hardships and dangers, than a circuit round the world would now.

The Church did this work then without the Bible,—before the Bible was formed. She had the truths of Christianity living in her own faith, and by the power of that truth, as thus actualized in her faith, she conquered the world, and overcame heresy. And now were the Church's troubles over?—the work of making disciples of all nations done? It was only to begin again.

During the period between the 5th and 10th centuries, we have another phase of the Church's life, and another illustration on a most grand scale, of the power of faith.

The Goths, the Heruli, the Franks, the Huns, the Vandals, and other fierce and barbarous tribes invaded the whole of Christianized Europe, and penetrated even into Africa. They moved forward with resistless power, sweeping away like a deluge almost every vestige of civilization, burning and sacking cities, devastating countries, destroying kingdoms, governments, laws and social order, burying under their own ignorance and barbarism all the monuments of ancient learning, so that intellectual and moral darkness covered the face of Europe.

The barbarians, who did this, were not men whom the Christians of that day could easily influence. They were not men of a soft, and docile disposition, men who could be easily turned from their established habits—easily persuaded to abandon their lives of lawless activity and almost constant warfare, and yield to the influences of superior intelligence. On the contrary, they were men of fierce passions, of strong wills, of never-tiring energy, and of ceaseless activity in their own wild way,—men who prided themselves on being superior in their rude ignorance (of which they boasted) and in their brute strength and fierce courage, to the effeminate, though cultivated peoples whom they overrun.

They honored and cherished the ideas of a wild and cruel heathenism, which they clung to with all the tenacity of their fierce and obstinate natures; and they despised, as the cause of weakness, if not of cowardice, the Christian Religion.

The most prominent attributes of their gods were war and cruelty. Hence they conquered only to destroy. They demolished every thing, and built up nothing. Nor did they remain in one country long enough to settle even into comparative quietude,—but passed on to new conquests,—or rather new devastations. The territory they last left was immediately invaded by another tribe still more rapacious and destructive. Thus they pushed on each other, as wave does wave, covering all Europe, for several centuries, with a deluge of barbarism and ignorance, fierce, indocile, cruel.

Here then was new work for Christians to do. Did they succeed? Before answering this question, let us endeavor to form an idea of the difficulty of the task. We will illustrate it by a comparison with a similar work, now incumbent on the Christian Church.

We have, in our own land, a people somewhat like the Northern hordes, which invaded Europe, in their fondness for a wild and savage life, in their preference for a state of constant warfare to that of peace, and in their unwillingness to adopt the habits of civilized life; a people, however, far inferior to those ancient barbarians, in intellectual vigor, in force of character, in tenacity of purpose, and in attachment to their religious legends. We refer to our Indian tribes.

We have for about three hundred years—a space of time equal in extent to that in which the Church broke down the power of heathenism in primitive ages—endeavored to Christianize these Indians. Have we succeeded? We have sent among them missionaries, and established schools, have given them ploughs, and printing presses, and translated the Bible into their native tongues. All this we have done. But this does not answer the question. Have we made *Christians* of these Indians? Our success, or rather our want of success, has been such, that the question itself sounds like a sar-

casm. For three hundred years we have been endeavoring, after a certain fashion, to fulfill our duty to these Indians, and the result of our efforts has been no perceptible improvement, but rather deterioration, and gradual extinction. Is not our experience, at the present day, very much after the pattern of the New England Puritans of old, who tried first preaching to them through George Elliot, and then concluded that Miles Standish, and the sword and musket, were the most effective way of dealing with them? Let us look upon a picture contained in an extract from Bancroft, the historian: "Because the Narragansett Indians had afforded shelter to such of the Pokanots, as had escaped extermination, the New England Colonists resolved to consider them as enemies. A little before the winter solstice, a thousand men, commanded by the brave Josiah Winslow, invaded their territory. * * * Feeble palisades could not check the valor of the white men, and the group of Indian cabins was soon set on fire. Thus were swept away the humble glories of the Narragansetts. Their winter's store of provisions—their baskets filled with corn—their cabins lined with mats, all the little comforts of savage life, and yet more, their old men—their women—their babes were consumed in one common conflagration."

"Then, indeed, was the cup of misery filled for these red men. Without shelter, and without food, they hid themselves in a cedar swamp, with no defense against the cold, but boughs of evergreen trees. They prowled the forest, and pawed up the snow, to gather nuts, and acorns; they dug the earth for groundnuts; they ate remnants of horse flesh as a luxury; they sank down and died from feebleness, and cold, and want of food."

So, too, the Pequod Indians: "After nearly a whole night," (says Bancroft,) "spent in prayer by the very learned and godly Stone, the New England army surprised the principal Pequod town at break of day. Fighting hand to hand, the massacre spread from wigwam to wigwam; but victory came too tardily. We must burn them, shouted Mason, (the New England commander) and cast a fire-brand to windward among the light mats of the Indian cabins. Hardly could the Colonists withdraw to

encompass the place, before the whole encampment was in a blaze. Did the helpless natives climb the palisades, the flames assisted the marksmen to take good aim at the unprotected men. Did they attempt to sally forth, they were cut down by the English broad-swords. The carnage was complete. Not an Indian was spared. About six hundred men, women, and children perished. Most of them in the hideous conflagration. In about an hour, the whole work of destruction was finished with the loss of but two of the Colonists."

Are not the above truthful pictures of the manner, in which we—a Christian nation—have dealt with, and are dealing with the Indian race? We send them Bibles and missionaries, and implements of civilized life; but we have not succeeded in Christianizing them. And we are driven at last to resort to the torch, the sword, the musket and the *scalping-knife* as the only practicable way of settling the questions, which arise between *their barbarity* and *our Christianity*. Or, along with the habits of civilized life, we teach them its vices, and inoculate them with its worst diseases, and thus we are gradually, but surely, working their destruction.

Is not this, too, a fair example of the action of our modern Christian civilization upon all the tribes and nations of heathendom, with which we are brought into contact? All the unchristianized nations melt away and become extinct. Witness the natives of the Sandwich Islands, of Australia, of Tasmania, of all the Islands of the South Sea.

Now the use I wish to make of these indisputable facts is simply this: If the difficulty in the way of our Christianizing barbarous tribes is so great, as to be equal to the removal of mountains, a virtual impossibility—what must have been the difficulty of the work,—imposed upon the Church of the middle ages in Christianizing the barbarians of those times? It must be remembered that we, in our missionary efforts, can use appliances, which had no existence in the middle ages. We approach barbarous nations too with the prestige of superiority, not only in education and the arts, but also in arms. The rela-

tion of the Christians of the early periods of the middle ages, to those whom they sought to Christianize, was just the reverse of that now described. The Christians were subjugated, and regarded by their barbarous conquerors as their inferiors.

Like the Ark of Noah, or the boat in which the Saviour slept upon the Sea of Galilee, the Church floated securely amid that deluge of nations, and while the waters were yet surging around her, she sent forth her heralds of salvation. All through that period of contradiction and confusion,—where we meet with great faith and great barbarism,—great virtues and great vices,—profound learning and profound ignorance—they labored steadily and in faith, holding up the cross. In that time of disarrangement and confusion, that time of distress, when men in despair felt that society had broken loose from its moorings—and the world was so disturbed, so disordered, so convulsed, that its longer existence was impossible, and that its end was at hand, the Church was the one only certain, steadfast landmark, the only sure source of hope and refuge.

Through all those ages the Church was most active, and most successful in Christianizing the natives. Her missionaries went forth, without families, without friends, without protectors. They had not the seal of the Secretary of State, and the power of the English, or American nation, to protect them from insult, and secure to them respect and safety. They had no trains of servants, and horses, and camels, and elephants, to transport their baggage, and secure their comfort and ease. They went forth with their staff and their scrip, sustained and protected by the power of FAITH; and they succeeded in their mission. To the Church of the middle ages the civilized world owes almost everything. It was her legislation which laid the foundation of law, of social order, of all the glories of that civilization with which the nations of the earth are now blest.

The Christians of those middle ages were *live* men, men who would be counted giants if they lived in this our day. They were men of INVINCIBLE FAITH, and by its power they removed mountains, and wrought still mightier miracles. We refer now

not only to the moral transformations they effected, but also to the actual physical miracles, which they wrought.*

It were desirable to draw, not from the miserable and false caricatures of those ages, which fill the pages of most modern writers, but from the original sources of history a few pictures of the holy men of those days, but space will not permit. They were men, who in their faith were wise as serpents. They understood the age and its wants, and to it they devoted all the energies of their strong natures—strong because energized by virginal purity of life, by prayer, by devout meditation, by perfect self-denial and self-abnegation, by earnest study of the truth comprehended in Christ Jesus, by contemplation and holy emulation of the Saints, who had preceded them, and, above all, by the strength derived from a faith which fulfilled itself in implicit and humble and perfect, unquestioning obedience to *authority*, the authority of the kingdom of Christ, the Church, the pillar and ground of the truth. Hence it was that the Saints of the middle ages have left behind them a record of usefulness, of self-denying devotion to the good of the people, of the human race, such as no subsequent age has furnished.

They were the *benefactors* of the people; their *protectors* against the disorders of the times. They interposed successfully, time and again, to uphold and vindicate the authority and law of Christ, as represented by His Church, against the arbitrary actions, or unrighteous enactments of passionate, licentious, or rapacious nobles, kings, and emperors.

They could, like John the Baptist, reprove a licentious ruler for his wicked lust, and compel him to bow to the voice and

---

* We know that it is the fashion of this age of skepticism and unbelief to sneer at the very possibility of a miracle in the middle ages, and to reject without discrimination the irrefutable proofs, by which many of those miracles are sustained, along with unauthenticated accounts of others, which have their origin in unintelligent and pious credulity. But many of those miracles are attested as strongly as any fact can be; and the same spirit of unquestioning and uninvestigating skepticism which leads to the rejection of faith in them, must also compel a like disbelief in the reality of the miracles wrought by the primitive Christians, and even of those wrought by the Apostles, and by the Saviour Himself. When, we would inquire of these sneering skeptics, did the age of miracles cease in the Christian Church? And where is the warrant in Scripture for believing that it has ceased, or ever will cease?

authority of the Church. They could resist and repress unchristian legislation. They could compel a rapacious king or noble to disgorge, and restore what he had plundered from the Church, from her charitable institutions, or from private individuals. They could prevent men from indulging, as they now too often do, in legal polygamy; divorcing the wives to whom they have been bound by ties, which only death can part, and living in concubinage, sanctioned by the civil law, with other women. They had *faith*, and therefore before their just rebukes wicked rulers quailed and repented. Have we this power? Have we this faith? When wicked, unchristian, *Anti-Christian* and *infidel* laws are enacted, can the Church successfully interpose? Look at the subject of marriage, taken out of the hands of the Church; at the education of the young, stripped, too, of all real, distinctive, Christian character. Look at your graveyards, bought by your fathers, as was the cave of Macpelah by Abraham, with money, that they might be places—*consecrated places forever*—where their bodies might be laid away to repose in peace, until the resurrection of the dead; and when the Legislature of a State, or the municipal council of a city or borough chooses, the children of those who bought and consecrated that burial place are robbed of their property, the homes of their fathers are sold for money, and the Christian faith that our bodies ARE "*temples* of the Holy Ghost," that there IS a "resurrection of the dead," is set at naught. Aye! and when a portion of the body of Christ, and certainly not the most insignificant, or the least venerable, unsuccessfully protests against all this, men, calling themselves Christian men, occupying influential positions in Christian communities, can rejoice at the unsuccessful result. It was not so in the middle ages.

Because of their faithfulness in the respects mentioned, these mediæval Christians are often held up to reproach, and represented as intermeddling, exacting, arbitrary, haughty, and impracticable. But so to-day would the official ruffian or robber, the arbitrary magistrate, the corrupt office-holder, the denier of the religious sanctity and indissolubility of marriage, the social disorganizer, the infidel agitator, all combine in denouncing

Christians who would faithfully rebuke and steadfastly resist them. When history is impartially written, it will be clear as day that to the Christian institutions of the middle ages, and to the men who stood at their head is due whatever of light and virtue, of civil right, and of social order, then prevailed.

But to return. Amid the most discouraging circumstances the Christians of those ages prosecuted their work. They established schools, libraries, and universities. By the slow process of the pen they multiplied copies of the sacred writings, and of other valuable productions. They taught agriculture and the arts, felled forests and drained marshes, introduced social order and prosperity where before lawlessness reigned, so that it became a German proverb, "That it was better to live under the shadow of a monastery, than within the walls of a city;" a Swiss maxim—"Better to be governed by a Bishop's crozier, than by a monarch's sceptre."

In connection with every monastery and Abbey there was usually a scriptorium, where a company of skilled writers was constantly kept employed in multiplying copies of sacred books. When, as was often the case in the disorders of those times, those institutions were attacked, the library—its most valuable treasure—was the first thing thought of, the first thing to be saved. There are frequent accounts in the writings of those times of monks flying to the hills half clad, with their arms filled with holy books, or bundles of them bound upon their shoulders.

That you may realize how mightily and successfully the Christians of those middle ages (sometimes miscalled dark) wrought to dispel ignorance, and stimulate the mind of those rude barbarians to activity, let me recount a few of the evidences of intellectual development, of social improvement, and of material progress, in which those times abound:

1. We owe to that period our modern languages. The Italian with its softness and sweetness; the Spanish, with its stately dignity; the French, with its grace and delicacy; the English, with its strength and practical directness; the German, with its copiousness and philosophic power. Language is but the

body in which ideas clothe themselves; and the period which could produce these languages must have been full of living thoughts.

2. To that period we owe the rise of modern poetry, the invention of rythmic measures, which distinguish modern from ancient poetry. Danté, Petrarch, and Chaucer, the father of English poetry, belong to that period; fixed stars of the first magnitude in the literary firmament.

3. To that period we owe the expression and actualization of the true relation of woman to society; and in this one idea we have a certain rule by which to measure man's real progress. In no barbarous nation has woman ever been allowed her proper place. Amid all the false refinement and luxury, and intellectual light of Grecian and Roman civilization, her worth was not appreciated, her true relation to man utterly ignored. Not so in the middle ages. During that period she was first conducted with respect and honor to her proper social position. Time will not permit me to dwell at length upon this point; suffice it to say, in the face of all the silly talk in this, our day, upon the subject, that it is to the middle ages that we must look for the exhibition of the true idea of woman, and her true relation to society. There we find her occupying a position *along-side* of man—his equal, his help-mate, his companion—not through the unsexing of woman, not by endeavoring to abolish that distinction which God made, when "male and female created He them," not by forcing woman to throw away her greatest charms, her strongest claim to man's admiration and love, her delicacy, her tenderness, and her modesty, but by recognizing the full value of those qualities, by doing full homage to the graces of her character, and the importance of the functions she was destined to fulfill in the social economy. Thus was woman allowed to remain woman, and at the same time respected, cherished, loved, and honored *as* WOMAN. And those ages abounded in noble women, whose memories deserve to be handed down to all ages for admiration. They were women who rose to distinction, not by unsexing themselves, but retaining all the grace, and delicacy, and refinement of their womanly

characters. Very many ladies in that age were distinguished for their learning; many understood thoroughly the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages. More than one taught philosophy and Belles-Lettres, in the University of Bologna. And nowhere can you find among the strong-minded women of the present day, any who are the superiors in literary attainments, in strength of character, or practical usefulness, to Anna Camena, Modesta di Pozzo, Cassandra Fideles, Isabella di Cordova, Isabella di Roseres, Aloysia Sigea, not to mention Heloise, Queen Margaret, of Sweden, and Joan, of Arc.

4. To the Christianity of the middle ages we owe all our present safeguards for the preservation of civil liberty. To that age we owe the Magna Charta, the trial by jury, the establishment of municipal governments, of representative governments, of confederated governments; all those ideas which we this day regard as essential to the best forms of social order. In the Christian legislation of an early period of the middle ages, were laid the foundations of law, and of all the glories of that civilization of which we boast.

Listen to an exposition of the true object of law, and to whom the law-making power belongs, handed down from those times:

"The law, strictly speaking, is directed primarily and principally to the common good. And to decree anything for the common benefit belongs either to the whole people, or to some one acting in their place." Listen to the utterance of that age as to the best form of government: "Wherefore that choice of rulers is best, when one is chosen for his merit, and under him other rulers are chosen for their merit. The government belongs to all, because the rulers may be chosen from any class of society, and the choice is made by all."

These words were written nearly 700 years ago, in the thirteenth century, by a man mighty in learning, in intellectual gifts, in personal piety, and purity—St. Thomas Aquinas.

5. To that age we owe in music—the invention of the Gamut, and the development of the element of harmony, which has done so much to give variety, expression, and power to music.

6. To that age we owe the discovery of the art of making paper out of cotton and linen.

7. Of illuminated writing, and of staining glass.

8. The general introduction of glass itself.

9. The art of printing by hand. This was first invented in the tenth century, and only more fully made known and brought into use by Faust and Guttenburg in the fifteenth.

10. The revival of Architecture.

11. The Mariner's Compass.

12. Gunpowder, spectacles, clocks.

13. Banks, banking systems, and post offices.

14. The introduction of the silk-worm.

15. Of Arabian figures, and the Arabic method of notation, A. D., 991. Algebra, 1412. Stone coal, 1307.

16. The establishment of Universities. Oxford, 866. Cambridge, 915. Paris, about 800. As for Italy, she swarmed with universities—at Rome, Padua, Pavia, Bologna, Pisa, and other places of less note. So in Spain. And misgoverned, down-trodden Ireland of to-day, had early in the middle ages universities, to which thousands of students, from distant countries in Europe, resorted. For universities then numbered students by thousands. In the thirteenth century the University of Paris had 18,000 students, and Oxford had 30,000.

But it was ITALY which, to use the language of the historian Hallam, "supplied the fire from which other nations in this first revival of letters, as afterwards in the second, lighted their torches—Lanfranc, Anselm, Peter Lombard, the founder of systematic theology in the twelfth century, Irnerius, the restorer of jurisprudence, Gratian, the author of the first compilation of the Common Law. The School of Salerno, which guided medical art in all countries, the first dictionary of the Latin language, the first treatise on Algebra, the first great work on Anatomy, are, says Hallam, as truly and exclusively the boast of Italy, during the middle ages, as are the restoration of the Greek Literature and of classical taste, during the fifteenth century.

Away then with the libel that the Church of the middle ages,

its institutions, or its clergy were an obstacle to civilization,—to intellectual, artistic, moral or political progress. It is a libel both upon Christianity itself, and upon History; and its repetition is always the result either of limited and superficial knowledge, or of a wilful and malicious perversion of the truth.

The Christians of those ages did not, it must be admitted, do, as we in this age do. They did not *first* try to civilize and educate, and *then* to Christianize. They reversed the process. They first Christianized, and then, by the stimulating, vitalizing power of Christian truth itself, they aroused and excited the slumbering energies of the mind. And this is the true process. And to this they owe their eminent success. Success—far beyond what we are achieving in enlightening barbarous nations in this age of telegraphs and railroads, when we worship with heathenish devotion the idea of material progress, and practically ignore the spiritual necessities of man.

It must be borne in mind, that in educating men, we do not raise them above the plane on which they naturally stand; but we leave them still subject to the influences and conditions, which necessarily rule them, in virtue of their relation by nature to sin, and to the kingdom of Satan. Their powers and faculties may be the more fully developed by mere education, but still remain unsanctified, and can thus be employed by the ruler of this world the more efficiently in his warfare against the kingdom of Christ. But when men, however rude and ignorant, are introduced into the kingdom of heaven, they are lifted thereby up to a higher plane, are placed in new relations, and within reach of *super*-natural influences and conditions. Whatever knowledge they then acquire, and whatever intellectual or social progress they make, will be sanctified by the power of Christianity and made subservient to its high and holy purposes. The ignoring of this in some cases, and its open denial in others, is the PROTON-PSEUDOS in the popular thinking of the present day, and in its schemes of political and social progress.

Of the extent of the Church's success in enlightening rude masses, the people of England, Belgium, France, Germany, and the United States, are the living witnesses. For it was their

ancestors who were the fierce and barbarous heathens who dwelt in, or overrun the wilds of Britain; the wastes and marshes which bordered the Baltic, the forests and mountains of Germany, the Alpine valleys of Switzerland, and the plains of France, and whom the Church of the middle ages subdued, Christianized and civilized. And while she was in process of successfully carrying this work forward, she was called upon to enter upon another equally great and difficult, growing out of the rise and diffusion of Mohammedanism. Originating in Arabia, it spread with great rapidity, subjugating, in a few years, Western Asia and Northern Africa. On the one hand it passed into Spain; on the other, it crossed the Hellespont, and invaded Europe from the South and East. Its two columns closing steadily towards each other, threatened to crush and swallow up all Christendom. Then the efficacy of faith was again displayed by the Church. When kings, nobles, and people, all alike distrusted their own valor and strength, and quailed in terror before Moslem bow and spear,—when the promptings of patriotism seem to lose their power, and even love for their hearths and homes, to give way to fear;—when men were ready, in their despair, to abandon country and all they commonly hold dear, the voice of the Church spoke forth in trumpet tones, and roused them to action. It was *her* FAITH which rolled back the invading flood and delivered Europe from the rule of the false prophet, and caused the splendor of the crescent to pale before the glory of the cross.

Those ages may well be called "ages of faith." It was by the power of *faith*,—faith in Christ, growing like the grain of mustard seed into faith in "His body, the Church,"—faith in His kingdom, and authority as comprehended in the Church, faith in the divine word as proclaimed by the Church, faith in divine grace as exhibited and handed over to the Christian in and through the sacraments of the Church—it was by *this* faith that the Church conquered the powers of earth and hell.

What are natural impossibilities, were not impossibilities to the Christians of those ages, for they were not simply men; men they were, but they were saints also, filled with and ener-

gized by FAITH,—whose fervent piety, holy enthusiasm, angelic purity, and self-denying devotion caused them to be set as fixed stars in the Christian firmament, where they will continue to shine with ever-increasing brightness through all ages.

ART. IX.—CHURCH UNION.

BY THE EDITOR.

Adoption of the Report of the Joint Committee of Conference on Re-union by the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church, New York, May 27th, 1869. *Circular Letter issued by the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America, and addressed to the Assemblies, Synods, and Judicatories of the several branches of the Evangelical Catholic Church in America, calling a National Convention to meet in New York on the third Tuesday of October*, 1869.

Resolutions referring to the union of the two leading divisions of the Lutheran Church, offered by Dr. Stork at a meeting of the General Synod in Washington, May, 1869.

A Sermon, delivered at the opening of the New School General Assembly, New York, May 20th, 1869, *by Rev. J. F. Stearns, D.D., Moderator of the last Assembly.*

THE papers here brought to view are sufficient to indicate something of the movements and dispositions looking towards union among some of the leading Protestant Churches of this country. They open up a chapter of history deserving of a place beside the chapter referring to the Catholic movement going on in the Episcopal Church, which we noticed in the last number of this Review.

We regard the re-union of the Presbyterian Church, as embraced by the General Assemblies of the Old and New School, as virtually accomplished. The following is the action, adopted unanimously by the N. S. Assembly, and with but seven dis-

senting votes in the O. S. Assembly, at their recent sessions in New York:

"Believing that the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom would be promoted by the healing of our divisions, and that the two bodies bearing the same name, having the same constitution, and each recognizing the other as a sound and orthodox body according to the principles of the confession common to both, cannot be justified by any but the most imperative reasons in maintaining separate, and, in some respects, rival organizations; we are now clearly of the opinion that the re-union of these bodies ought, as soon as the necessary steps can be taken, to be accomplished, upon the basis hereinafter set forth:—

"1. The Presbyterian Churches in the United States of America, namely, that whose General Assembly convened in the Brick Church in the city of New York, on the 20th day of May, 1869, and that whose General Assembly met in the Church of the Covenant in the said city on the same day, shall be re-united as one Church, under the name and style of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, possessing all the legal and corporate rights and powers pertaining to the Church previous to the division in 1838, and all the legal and corporate rights and powers which the separate Churches now possess.

"2. The re-union shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common standards; the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged to be the inspired Word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures; and the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall be approved as containing the principles and rules of our polity."

This basis was ordered to be sent down to the Presbyteries, to meet on or before the 15th day of October, 1869, and the action had thereon is to be reported to a meeting of the two Assemblies, to be convened in Pittsburg, Pa., on the second Wednesday of November, 1869. There can be little doubt that

this action of the General Assemblies will be confirmed by the lower courts, and the union of these branches of the Presbyterian Church consummated within the next six months.

The Lutheran Church is divided very much as the Presbyterian has been, into two leading bodies, represented by the General Council and the General Synod. The difference between them, however, we regard as broader and deeper. The General Synod can hardly be said to represent a united or homogeneous Church. It contains within it, alongside of other material, those elements of American Lutheranism which have fallen under the foreign Spirit of Methodism. There is a constant struggle between the principles of the educational system of religion, and the emotional, as this latter exhibits itself in the revival, anxious-bench meetings. The General Council, according to our view, is the exponent of Lutheranism in its true, historical, character. It represents also, the larger Church numerically. The resolutions looking towards re-union, offered by Dr. Stork, one of the editors of the Lutheran Observer, are stated in a secular paper to have been adopted, but in the Observer to have been laid on the table, by the General Synod, on the ground that the General Council would not likely entertain them favorably. They present no principle of union, and seem to have been prompted by *feeling* merely, which is very good in its place, but which affords little to rest any movement of this kind upon.

The Circular from the Reformed (Dutch) Church, looks to a less intimate, but more comprehensive union. It does not contemplate an attempt immediately to reach an organic union of all Protestant Churches, but rather to discuss the project of forming some outward alliance, which may perhaps prepare the way for a closer union in the future, or if not, then to secure co-operation in such measures as may be jointly carried forward without affecting their present denominational features.

It seems somewhat singular that the Dutch Reformed Church should have waited so long (the Circular was adopted a year ago) without presenting it to the Synod of the German Reformed Church. It was received with favor by the General Assemblies,

and committees were appointed to take in charge the details of having its request carried out.

These facts, and others that might be referred to, indicate a desire for union among the divided Churches of Protestantism. There is no doubt that the result of the late civil war is exciting an influence, though it may be unconsciously, upon the spirit of the Churches. National life and the life of the Church are very closely related. The tendency generally has been to form national churches. This has not been done in this country, but the strong desire for union which was strengthened and sustained by the war, is calculated to bring in its train a tendency towards union in all departments of life. Beyond this mere sentiment or feeling we can see little brought out in these movements for union.

Strange enough the Presbyterians are determined to unite, though the doctrinal position of each School remains unchanged. Their efforts thus far have clearly developed the fact, that the difference or antithesis, which was once considered sufficiently solemn and serious to rend the Church asunder, is not at all reconciled, nay, that any attempt to touch it would defeat the movement for union. After attempting to come together by adopting an explicit platform, and failing, they now resolve to let the opposition or difference rest, and come together at any rate. The Scriptures and the Confession of Faith, that is all, and that is just what they had in 1838, when they quarrelled as to which interpreted them rightly. This, we say, looks somewhat strange. We do not find fault with it. We rather think they are now acting right; but then they are convicting the action of their fathers, in making the separation, of great thoughtlessness and folly. They never should have divided on differences which certainly in no way impair the soundness of their Creed.

But it is just here that their theologians differ from the clergy generally, and the people. They do see a serious and a dangerous difference, and they have, therefore, very generally resisted the re-union so long as the difference remains unadjusted. The larger portion of the clergy and the people are moved

mainly by their feeling in the case, and seeing no patent obstacle in the way, they are resolved for once, to make the theologians yield. "It will be pleasant to be together once more, we will be so much stronger, and can build up Presbyterianism with so much better success." Well, we hope they may get along peacefully together. Their denominational spirit is strong enough to overbalance a good many influences towards disunion. Let them now work harmoniously together to give Calvin's system, as interpreted by them, its full force and meaning in American Christianity.

We do not expect to see Presbyterianism become less denominational or sectarian, and more Catholic in its spirit, than it was before. Rather we expect it to become more partizan. That is one of the necessary evils that go along with the strengthening of Christianity in the *denominational* form in which we have it in this country. If Presbyterianism was exclusive, and narrow, and bigoted before, it is likely to become more so hereafter. The same would be the case, doubtless, with any of the other denominations, to a greater or less extent. It is perhaps more characteristic of Presbyterianism than some other phases of Protestant Christianity to be narrow and intolerant. This comes from the one-sided development of Calvinism in that denomination. They seem to have inherited Calvin's severity and intolerance, without some of his more Catholic and churchly traits. But, with some difference of degree, the strengthening of any other denomination would be attended with the same disposition. Denominational Christianity is not Catholic, but partial and more or less narrow in its spirit.

The problem, therefore, remains as to how denominational prejudices are to be overcome, and denominational life superseded by a life more catholic and free. This problem is not touched by the movements towards union now going on. Dr. Stearns does indeed point out in his sermon the necessity for a broader generalization, by which, when family centres are once formed, these families, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, &c., may be gathered together in one general organization, but he points out no principle on which this end is likely

to be reached. The probability is, that when once these leading denominations become thus strengthened and intrenched in their strongholds, finding that no one could hope to absorb the others, they would strive to form some terms of mutual alliance, and thus the real divisions would be perpetuated. Evidently the case requires something more than this.

Looking, now, away from these outward arrangements for denominational co-operation and confederation, is there not a more inward movement noticeable in Protestantism, which carries with it more promise of church unity? We think there is. There are *tendencies* at work which, to our mind, are more important then any merely outward alliances between the denominations. Reformations in the Church do not come through resolutions of conventions,—they are not legislated or made, but they are born. Hence, for every advance in the Church, there are always preparations in the inward life.

There is coming to be a marked tendency in Protestantism towards what we may call churchliness, a growing disposition to look for something more than the merely subjective upon which to rest. Christianity is felt to be an objective life, and the Church a supernatural constitution, or order of grace. There is in various directions a disposition manifested to bring back much that has been cast away in the extreme Protestant movement. Without lessening in any way the importance which Protestantism has taught men to attach to the subjective factor, to experience, to repentance, faith, etc., it is felt that there is another factor which must be recognized, in order that experience may be worth any thing. The holy ministry, the sacraments, the preached word, the order of worship, the Creed, these are looked to as standing in a real, objective, kingdom, in which Christians are born and nourished.

These tendencies are deeper than mere denominational life. Hence the apparent contradiction, that certain denominations are dividing, and others are giving forth tokens of coming divisions, while these other union movements are going on. The explanation, however, is not difficult. The Church will not come together on a false basis. In the Episcopalian Church

the antagonism of these opposing tendencies threatens division. In the Lutheran Church the division has taken place.

These tendencies, moreover, give rise to new sympathies that ignore denominational lines. A few evangelicals, so called, whether in the Reformed or Lutheran Church, will affiliate with the rationalistic wing of Protestantism in other denominations, while they rebel against the sound churchly feeling and life of their own denominations. And so, too, there is more real, and earnest sympathy between the churchly elements in these two denominations, than each has with the rationalistic spirit in its own denomination. The German Reformed Church could much more easily unite with the General Council Lutherans, than with a Reformed Church which stands in the spirit of Puritanism; and we have heard General Synod Lutheran ministers say that *their* people are more Presbyterian in sympathy than Lutheran, in the old historical sense. So, New Measure Lutherans would feel quite at home in the Methodist Church, and *vice versa*.

It is evident from these considerations, that there are undercurrents of life at work in the Protestant Church, which may eventually bring about new combinations, and resolve the conflict in Protestantism to a struggle between two prevailing tendencies. And we regard this conflict as far more important for the future of Protestantism than all the manœuvering between denominations to effect unions where there is no inward sympathy and agreement. Many of these denominations have lost their original, historical character, and their continuance under the old name is but a burlesque on their origin. Even at best, denominational lines are but temporary. They must eventually pass away. Why then should not the attention of those, who work and pray, not only for the interest of a denomination, but for the whole Protestant interest, be directed to the one great issue here presented?

So far as faith is concerned, there ought to be no difficulty for all who stand in hearty sympathy with the Church of all ages, to rally around the Apostles' Creed. Let it, in its ancient historical sense, become authority for our modern confessions,

and we have once more a common starting point. Those who are in true sympathy with it would be able at least to understand each other, and when the Creed is again held up as containing the faith once delivered to the saints, the people will again say, we do hear these men speak in our own language.

Some may be impatient, and think that there is a shorter and easier way to union. It has become an axiom with certain ones, that creeds and theologies must be set aside before any union can take place. That is not our view. We have more faith in life movements, in tendencies, in earnest struggle, engaged in with faith to overcome the inner antagonisms of our common Protestant Christianity, than in all the outward conventional arrangements that are made under the impulse of mere feeling. They are made in a day, and in a day they come to nought.

This Churchly tendency, or Church movement as it has been called, forms a far more important feature in the history of the Protestant Church in our day, than all the unions and alliances which look to a patching up of our miserable sect system. It is a broad and general movement, showing that it comes, not from outward influences, or calculations of utility, but from a real inward growth in the life of the Church. It has been working with immense effect in England, it occupies men's thoughts in Germany, and it is showing itself in various directions in America. Indeed we are hardly conscious of the change that has been wrought in this country by this tendency, within the last twenty years. This change may be explained partly by a more liberal spirit having been infused into the churches of this country through communication with the Christianity of the old world, and especially by the large infusion of German theology. But this is not the whole explanation. There is evidently a reaction going on in the life of the church in this country; and this reaction forms a tendency which is growing every year, and is becoming more powerful than denominational attachments.

The presence of this churchly tendency appears in almost every historical denomination, in the two sides, or schools, the old and the new. Thus we have high and low-church Episcopalians, old and new Lutherans, in the Methodist Church a

settling down to a more steady spirit, a growing attention to the religious training of the young, &c., and in the Presbyterian Church also there are some minds that begin to look in this direction. The Dutch Reformed Church is at least trying to find out wherein it differs from Puritanism and Presbyterianism, and is more disposed now than formerly to speak of the liturgy and the import of the sacraments. The German Reformed Church is very generally pervaded by this tendency, and to it is mainly owing its new vigor.

Of course we can specify but a few of the indications of what we have referred to. Others, such as the great change going on in church architecture, the respect for the creeds and customs of the early church, &c., will suggest themselves to the reader.

Over against this tendency, there is arrayed another spirit. The radical, subjective, individualistic spirit, which is tending with great force towards humanitarianism, and which seems to be gathering up into itself the elements of rationalism and infidelity; this spirit arrays itself against the tendency of which we have spoken. This spirit, we say, tends with great force towards humanitarianism. It does so just because it ignores the objective factor in Christianity. It flourishes for a time as pietism, but taking no other ground for its activity than experience, it soon shows its weakness, and leads to fanaticism. Seeing this, the intelligent soon come to look upon it as only one of the exhibitions of man's religious nature, and it is then classed alongside other religious developments, and thus Christianity, in the minds of these persons, finds its place as only a religious system among others. Thus it has led to infidelity in New England with such men as Parker, Emerson, &c. There are, indeed, many who earnestly protest against the consequences, but their protests are powerless so long as they stand in the false system.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

CHIPS FROM A GERMAN WORKSHOP, by Max Müller, M. A., Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. Two vols. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

A truly expressive title for a most admirable book, or rather series of books. More than twenty years ago the celebrated Bunsen succeeded, after much literary diplomacy, in persuading the directors of the East India Company to provide for publishing the Rig-veda, to the translation of which, with a commentary, Max Müller, with true German industry and perseverance, has been devoting his life. When Bunsen informed him of the arrangement which he had made, he said to Müller; "Now you have a work for life—a large block that will take you years to plane and polish. But mind, let us have from time to time, some chips from your workshop."

And here are some of the chips, in two volumes of between three and four hundred pages each, on topics that must awaken the deepest interest of each student and lover of his race.

The essays in the first volume, may be regarded as contributions to "the science of religion." The author rightly, we think, regards religion as the deepest interest of humanity, and the study of the world's religion, as offering one of the most important fields for the study of the history of our race. "Every religion, even the most imperfect and degraded, has something that ought to be sacred to us; for there is in all religions a secret yearning after the true though unknown God. Whether we see the Papua squatting in dumb meditation before his fetich, or whether we listen to Firdusi exclaiming, 'The height and depth of the whole world have their centre in Thee, O, my God! I do not know Thee what Thou art; but I know that Thou art what Thou alone canst be,' we ought to feel that the place whereon we stand is holy ground."

The new discoveries and study of the sacred books of religions of Eastern Asia, certainly have opened up a new chapter in the study of world-religions. The materials are thus being gathered for the construction of a science in this department. The only true religion need not shun any new light, that may be reflected from this quarter, but rather welcome it.

True, there are some who are ready to go off in enthusiasm whenever anything in a heathen religion turns up, which seems to contain the same truths as the Christian religion, and certain ones may seek

to turn this into an argument, to prove that this latter is only a religion among religions, but this argument in the end, can and will be turned with increasing power the other way. Thus the heathen mythology of Greece and Rome, has furnished the very best arguments for the truth of the one true religion. Such writers as James Freeman Clarke, and others in the Atlantic Monthly, are seeking to turn the argument in another direction, to prove, namely, that the religion of Christ is one in kind, though more perfect than these heathen religions. We may admit their premises, but the conclusion which they draw may be easily overthrown. Religion, on its human side, has a common basis in our nature; but one only is absolute, because it is revealed in Jesus Christ, while all others are merely projections of man's want. We, therefore, welcome so learned and reliable a contribution as this of Max Müller.

The second volume, bearing in the same direction, is occupied in giving new and more rational explanations of the heathen mythology. The author finds these explanations in the new discoveries that are being made in the languages of primitive tribes and nations. Especially does he find great help in the study of the Sanskrit, which throws new light on the Greek and Latin tongues. The only fault we find here is that he rationalizes too much. The element of mystery inheres in all religions, and we wrong them when we attempt to rule this out.

We know of few recent publications that will better repay perusal and study than these volumes of Max Müller. As such we commend them to the readers of the Review.

The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, Conybeare & Howson, complete and Unabridged Edition; Two volumes in one. C. Scribner & Co. 1869.

It seems that some one has sent out to the public an abridged and imperfect edition of this standard work. This has induced Mr. Scribner to issue the original and complete work, which was originally published in two volumes, in one large volume. In this form it contains all, even the valuable maps, which it contained in the first form, while at the same time it is rendered cheaper, and may be purchased by a larger number of readers. We have for years had the first work in our library, and regarded it as one of the very best on this subject. It is exhaustive. It will not likely be superseded. Those who have it not, and desire a complete work on the Life and Epistles of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, should procure it. And we would urge them to get this volume in place of any one less complete.

The Controversy between True and Pretended Christianity. An essay delivered before the Massachusetts Methodist Convention held in Boston, Oct. 15, 1868, by Rev. L. T. Towns-

end, Hist. Professor Theol. in the Boston Theol. Sem., Boston: James P. Magee, No. 5, Cornhill, 1869.

This is a tract of 82 pages, intended to bring out the issue between orthodoxy, and New England Unitarianism.

New England is rapidly lapsing into a form of Christianity, which is little better, perhaps more dangerous, than open infidelity. The virus which is corrupting it, is *humanitarianism*, a hydra which lifts its numerous heads in all the ages of Christianity, a new one appearing as rapidly as one is cut off. It now leagues itself with German Rationalism, whose research and learning it borrows.

We are glad to see the issue broadly made by this Methodist Seminary, but we cannot say that the author, in this tract, gets far into the merits of the question. It is not enough to merely point out where this rationalism departs from orthodoxy. The case requires that the old conception of the Church shall be held up to confront it. Until this is done, as it has not been done as yet in New England, we have little hope of seeing the current turned.

WOMAN AS GOD MADE HER; The true Woman, by Rev. J. D. Fulton, to which is added, Woman vs. Ballot, Boston: Lea & Shepherd, 1869.

A pamphlet of fifty pages, in which the author treats of, 1. Woman as God made her; 2. Woman as a helpmeet; 3. Woman as a tempter; 4. The glory of motherhood; 5. Mariolatry not of Christ; 6. Woman's work, and woman's mission; 7. Woman vs. Ballot. It is written in good style, and breathes a sound Christian spirit. The subject of which it treats is engaging no small share of public attention. The prevalence of theories in regard to woman, and her sphere and mission inimical to plain teachings of Scripture, seems to render it necessary to speak on this subject. We think that those of the female sex, who seek to reverse the order of nature, and bring woman into the arena of politics and public life, tearing her away from the sanctuary of the home circle, are really the greatest enemies of their sex.

BAPTISM *vs.* IMMERSION.—A pamphlet of thirty-eight pages, containing a Review of the New Testament of the Immersionists, by George B. Jewett. This essay appeared first in the *Congregational Review*, and has been published in its present form, for more general circulation, which it certainly merits. We regard it as unanswerable. The Baptist denomination have been anxious to produce a new translation of the New Testament, for a long time. It may be the time is coming when a new translation will be produced which will supersede the present one; for it is far from being perfect. We think this review fully establishes the failure of this candidate for the honor. The subject is handled with the masterly ability which it merits. The tract is published by G. M. Whipple, & A. A. Smith, Salem, Mass.

A Manual of the Reformed Church in America, by Edward Tanjore Corwin, Pastor at Millstone, N. J., second edition, Revised and Enlarged, New York: Board of Publication of Reformed Church, 103 Fulton street, 1869.

An excellent hand-book of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, of about 400 pages, containing a Historical Introduction. We cannot agree with the author, that the Heidelberg Catechism and the Westminster Confession, are substantially identical in doctrine, and that the only difference is, that the one is composed from a philosophical, the other from an experimental stand-point.

The book then treats of The Ministry, The Churches, The Classes, Synods, Institutions, and Boards. It contains much valuable information. The reference to German ministers is based on Harbaugh's Fathers of the Reformed Church, and his life of Schlatter. To be had at the Publication House of the Reformed Church, 54, N. 6th street, Phila.

Studies in Philosophy and Theology, by Joseph Haven, D.D., Professor in Chicago Theol. Sem. Andover: Warren F. Draper, Main street, 1869.

Subjects treated: 1. Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton; 2. Mill versus Hamilton; 3. The Moral Faculty; 4. Province of Imagination in Sacred Oratory; 5. The Ideal and the Actual.

Studies in Theology; 1. Natural Theology; 2. The Doctrine of the Trinity; 3. Theology as a Science; 4. Miracles; 5. Sin, as related to human nature and the divine mind; 6. Arianism. To be obtained at Smith, English & Co., 23 North Sixth street, Philadelphia.

The Life of Cain, by Rev. Isaac K. Loos, Author of "*Salome the Dancer.*" Philadelphia: S. R. Fisher & Co., 54, North Sixth street.

The subject here selected by the respected author is both new and interesting. Many lives have been written since men began to make books (of which, Solomon says there is no end), but no one, so far as we know, ever before wrote the life of Cain. Yet why should his biography not be written? Is it because so little is known of him? Read this little work and see how much can be known, or at least profitably thought of, from the few hints and facts given in the inspired record. Is it because he was a wicked man? But the Bible itself gives us the lives of the wicked as well as the good. Valuable lessons of warning may be derived from such lives. The author gleans in departments of sacred Scripture, which, for the most part, have been overlooked by other writers. His success here shows, that he might find something fresh and new even where others *have* gleaned. Salome the Dancer, and Cain, we have now from his pen. We hope he may give the Church yet other results of his studies.

Much in the life of Cain, of course, must be a matter of supposi-

tion or probability. The author, however, has given us no wild fancies, but only such probable things as sound reason and the circumstances surrounding life in that early age of the world, fully warrant. The style is chaste. The foot-notes in one or two instances quote authorities for what, it seemed to us, is sufficiently plain without any support beyond the author's own assertion. If our estimation, or judgment, is of any account with him, we give it in candor when we say, that the author of the "Life of Cain," and "Salome the Dancer," has not mistaken his vocation, in placing his name among the authors (the list is a worthy one) of the Reformed Church.

CREED AND CUSTOMS: A Popular Hand-Book, treating of the chief Doctrines and Practices of the Reformed Church, in the U. S., by George B. Russell, A. M. Philadelphia: Reformed Church Publication Board, No. 54, North Sixth street.

This is a solid volume of 467 pages, by one well known in the Reformed Church, the editor of the book department of our establishment in Philadelphia. It is one of the first volumes issued since the establishment of this department in our Publishing House, and certainly is well worthy of an extensive circulation. As it may be made the subject of an article for a future number of the REVIEW, we shall not enter upon an extensive consideration of the important topics of which it treats now.

The Reformed Church, since its first proper beginning in the Palatinate, as a leading branch of the Protestant Church, has passed through many and severe trials, not the least of which was the withering influence of Rationalism and fanatical Pietism. In its struggle with this double enemy, it came off victorious. As a result, it came to a proper consciousness of its life and genius, and now seeks earnestly to fulfill its true mission. This volume of Mr. Russell gives a full and fair statement of this consciousness, as the Church stood at the close of the Tercentenary Jubilee in this country. So far as we have been able to examine it, we believe it is a faithful statement of our Creed and Customs at the present time. The style is clear and strong, the sentiment decided, and altogether the book contains just such information as our own people greatly need, and we hope it may find many readers outside our own denomination. Let the Church see to it that its circulation be as general as it so amply merits. The editor has led the way in performing a labor for the Church, which must result in immense good. Let him be properly sustained by other writers, and means to carry it on successfully, and the blessed fruits will soon appear throughout the Church.

WATERLOO; A sequel to The Conscript of 1813, translated from the French of Erckman-Chatrian, with six full page illustrations New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

At the close of The Story of a Conscript, the author makes Joseph

say: "If people of sense tell me that I have done well in relating my campaign of 1813—that my story may show youth the vanity of military glory, and prove that no man can gain happiness save by peace, liberty, and labor—then I will take up my pen once more, and give you the story of Waterloo!"

The good report of people of good sense came, and here is Waterloo. Many a story of it has been told. We remember hearing an intensely interesting one from Rev. D. Willers, a father in the ministry of the Reformed Church, who himself was in the great battle. But this book tells it as few writers can. If any one wants books that combine the fascination of the best works of fiction with facts and history, or if any parents wish to place in the hands of their children reading which will please and profit them, without any injury resulting, but much good, then get The Story of a Conscript and Waterloo.

FOREIGN MISSIONS; THEIR RELATIONS AND CLAIMS, by Rufus Anderson, D.D., LL.D, Late Foreign Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 1869.

This is a volume of 373 pages, gotten up in neat and plain style. It contains a series of lectures delivered in the Theol. Seminaries at Andover, Princeton, Bangor, Hartford, Auburn, and New York city (Union Seminary).

The subject treated, must always possess peculiar interest for the Christian Church. Just now, also, when the whole of Eastern Asia, with its teeming millions, is brought so near to us, it is invested with new interest. Young men preparing for the ministry especially should read and ponder its truths.

THE STORY OF FATHER MILLER, written for his Young Friends, by Franz Hoffman, translated by Lewis Henry Steiner. Philadelphia: Reformed Church Publication Board, 54, North Sixth street.

Another book from the Reformed Church Publication Board. It looks well—comes from the German, and is put in English dress, by one who understands the work. It is published by the fund of the Trinity Sunday-school of the Reformed Church, York, Pa.

Let no one think it is a story of the admirable and beloved pastor in York. To call him Father Miller, might be regarded by some as Romanizing, though every Protestant minister is a Father to his flock, just as much as a Romish priest. No, it is an interesting story of honesty, and pious trust in Providence, by a true and good man in the *Vaterland*. Of course the Sunday-schools will all get it. And many a one older and more learned than Sunday-school boys and girls will read it with pleasure and profit.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1869.

Art. I.—THE TRUE IDEA OF LIBERAL EDUCATION.

BY TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN UNION COLLEGE.

It is quite common to define education from its Latin etymology. *Educatio* and *eductio*, it is said, are the same. It is the leading or drawing forth of the soul from its chaotic state into one of order, regularity, culture, finished form. A trite comparison is furnished by the statue in the block of marble. As the sculptor brings out form, proportion, beauty, from the formless mass; so education forms the man, develops him, gives character to that which before existed characterless and undistinguished in the common ore or mass of unwrought humanity. We doubt whether those who first used the term had so transcendental an idea as this. The application of the word came, most likely in the first place, from the simple act of *leading forth* the child from the nursery to the common school room; just as in Greek *παιδαγωγὸς* (pedagogue), the servant who led the boy by the hand, and *παιδαγωγία* (pedagogy), had the same primary idea. It is, however, a very pretty notion, very suggestive; and we have, therefore, no objection to making it the general ground of our very general remarks.

It is not safe, however, to reason from a simile, or a metaphor, without using great discrimination. This figure of the

statue, if pushed too far, favors too much the false notion that education, or the *drawing out* of the man, consists wholly in what is called the development of his faculties. If there is great truth in this idea, there is also connected with it no small amount of error. What makes it, sometimes, the more mischievous, is the fact that it is a theory often accompanied by a practice derived from an opposite philosophy. There is much talk everywhere of development, whilst in fact some of our favorite methods of instruction would seem to aim at imparting the greatest amount of fact knowledge, and that too of the most outward kind. In shunning both extremes, it may, indeed, be said that education is the proper *unfolding* of the human mind, and that the means for effecting this is the proper introduction of proper knowledge from without. The soul is not a mere *capacity*, a place for holding; it is not a mere *faculty* or power; it is not a mere system of blank spiritual energies, without any inward spiritual light to give them meaning and direction. The soul has a knowledge of its own, ideas of its own: we can never give up this until we are prepared to give up all philosophy, and all religion along with it; but this inborn knowledge becomes consciousness when it is evoked by outward things, and brings its innate rules to measure outward things; to give connecting law, and shaping form, to what would be, otherwise, shapeless outward facts. Hence external knowledge is needed, but it is to open, not to fill the soul. It comes, not to pour in, but to let out, the spiritual light from which alone it derives its own true visibility. It must be adapted to this; and therefore it is that, in education, much more depends on a right selection than on the amount or accumulation of external science.

Education then is not wholly development nor wholly outward acquisition. Both are, at the same time, means and ends, and both mutually act and react upon each other. The introduction of outward knowledge tends to call out and strengthen certain powers and ideas of the soul: these, again, when thus cleared and elevated, enable us better to survey the whole field of truth, and to estimate aright the comparative value of different kinds of knowledge. Thus both go to form that intellectual harmony,

that healthy mind, which we regard as peculiar to the *liberally* educated man. A right position in the domain of truth is of far more importance than any amount of mere accumulated knowledge. The acquisition of a true central point from which whatever we do see, be it ever so little, shall be seen in its true place, and in its proper relations, is of immensely more value than a wider field of outward vision, embracing a vast range of objects, but where every thing is distorted by the parallaxes and refractions, the effects of the false stations *from* which, and the perverted media *through* which, they are viewed.

There is another error connected, we think, with the perversion of the simile aforesaid. The statue is *educed*, brought out from the common mass of marble. So the soul, it is said, is *educated*, that is, brought out from the unwrought common mind; it is chipped and polished into individual distinctness. This will do very well for a figure, but its application may be false and mischievous. It may be meant, and generally is meant, that the man's individuality, or his originality as some would say, is educed. This individual, so brought out, is made to think *for* himself, and of himself: he is released from the trammels of authority, and from dependence on other minds. Now we do not hesitate to take a position which may be styled the converse, if not the opposite, of the preceding. With more of truth may it be said that the grand design of education, certainly of *liberal* education, is to *educe* or draw us out of our native individualism into the common humanity; and that the most thoroughly and liberally educated, be their knowledge more or less, are those who have experienced the most of that humanizing process through which our views are continually more and more directed to that destiny, and that knowledge, which pertains to man as man, in distinction from that which concerns him in his individual, partial, and professional relations.

It is in this sense that the greatest men have ever been the least original; and that the liberally educated man, the true scholar, has more of catholicity, more feeling with and for the masses, than the self-styled reformer who claims their hearing

on the ground that he has thought out *for himself*, and wrought out *for himself*, all the hard problems of humanity. It was not pedantry, but a sound philosophy, that gave the name *humanitas*, or *studia humanitatis*, to erudition, education, liberal knowledge; that culture, in short, that gives a man a community of sentiment, a common rational life, with the thoughtful and reasoning humanity of all ages. As an illustration of our general position here, it may be said that this same uniting and harmonizing process may be traced in any one science, or any one art, viewed solely in reference to itself. Before musical culture, for example, "each man has his psalm" and his song, or what is absurdly called his natural taste. When, however, the attention is closely given to music as a science, or a system, it is soon found to be something more than a matter of *sense* and individual ears; it is seen to have a common and universal *reason*. In proportion to cultivation, the mere sense tastes of individuals converge, more and more, to a common standard. As real advance is made, there is discovered, more and more, a unity in which all truly cultivated musicians agree, and which, from this very fact, is shown to be the true natural taste delivered from the individual monstrosities. The best music is ever the most catholic. Nothing could be further from the individual conceits, and yet every individual who has the least ear or soul for music appreciates the strains of Handel. Nay, more, he thinks it is just the kind of music that he *could* have made, certainly that he *would* have made, himself.

As it is with this single branch of scientific culture, so also, though in much higher degree, is it with that general educational culture of which we speak; consisting in a harmonious combination of all departments of knowledge, philosophical, philological, physical, political, social, moral, and theological. Just in the ratio in which it has been thorough and extensive, will there be a drawing together of all cultivated minds, with a merging of those ideas so prized for their fancied novelty, and which grew out of the individualizing spirit. Just as the true educational process goes on, the love of truth takes the place of the love of originality; and these conceits are dropped, one by

one, as dogmas and ideas that are found to have been broached over and over again in other forms, and exploded again and again in other ages of the world. Whilst this is taking place in the one direction, there is brought out more and more that conservative harmony on all great fundamental truths which is the only basis on which can be expected any true or permanent progress. In this way, too, the individual strength and characteristics, and power for good, are more truly exhibited, more truly made available, because grounded on so sure and catholic a foundation. The greatest men, intellectually and morally, have ever stood out most prominently as individuals, not from mere individualizing or personally original traits, but from the very fact that more than others of their age and nation, did they represent the catholic mind of humanity.

We can only give here some of the most general views in respect to the nature and design of that discipline we style education; and first let us consider the legitimate extent of the term. It is a very common error to embrace under this word far more than, with any fairness, can be said to belong to it. It is sometimes extended to the animal and material, as well as the intellectual and moral nature. Gymnastics are called education. We have heard the term applied to dress and dietetics. Again, it is regarded as embracing, not only all that pertains to man, as man, in his most universal relations, but also the partial methods and processes, and corresponding culture, that pertain to particular arts, trades and occupations, by which one man, or one class of men, is distinguished from another. Beside the general intellectual discipline of the school and the college, together with the peculiar culture belonging to what have been styled the learned professions, it is made to take in the partial pursuits of partial objects, having little or nothing to connect them with science in general, or that body of truth which, in its principles, may be said to pertain to humanity, however partial and particular may be some of its applications. Hence some insist that agriculture and the mechanic arts are parts of education, not only in respect to the chemical and

mathematical science that may be partially demanded for some of them, but also in regard to their specific processes of operation. They should be taught, it is insisted, in our common schools; professorships should be established for them in our colleges.

Now there is a reason for including agriculture, in such an enlargement of the idea, which cannot well be urged in favor of other wealth-gaining pursuits. The cultivation of the earth was man's allotted destiny after the fall; it has been a universal occupation at all times, among all nations, and all classes of all nations. It thus becomes, not so much a partial employment, as a matter of general interest. It is confined to no one rank. The high and the low, the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant, are found among the tillers of the soil. More than any of the trades, or partial occupations, is it connected with the general morals, the general intelligence, the social and political health. There is something in it more spiritual than in any other of the arts, and more favorable to contemplation, to pure and elevated thought. It is that employment of the hands in which a man is led to think most directly of God, His providence and ways. In an agricultural population there is generally found a sound and meditative, if not an acute intelligence. Hence there is reason in the opinion that would regard it as a branch of general knowledge, forming a proper part of fundamental and general education; not as belonging to a partial course intended only for those who mean to devote themselves to it for a livelihood, but for all classes, in the same manner as grammar, and mathematics, and moral philosophy. Thus regarded, it may become one of the liberal sciences, and a part of the *cultus humanus*, or liberal education. It was thus, as a matter of general interest, that the Church and State of Holland required it to be studied at the universities, especially by all theological students and future pastors, as being those who would come in closest communion with the common mind, and would have the most to do in forming the common intelligence.

For these reasons, a concession may be cheerfully made in favor of agriculture. When, however, the same claim is put in for other pursuits strictly partial, the question immediately arises, Where shall we stop? If one partial interest is to be embraced in this enlarged idea of education, and provision accordingly made for it in our seminaries, there can, consistently, be no bound assigned short of that which includes all. The mason, the builder, the mechanic of every kind, as well as the merchant and the manufacturer, may make the same demand, that their respective art or business should have its professorship and its special department in all our seminaries. No one, of course, will be so foolish as to think that the writer intends, or feels, any disrespect towards any of the occupations thus named. They are simply mentioned as furnishing examples of the absurd extremes to which we are driven in carrying out a false principle. Some of them, it is true, involve in their practice elementary principles of science. It would be hard to name any human employment that does not, more or less. These principles, however, belong to a course of general instruction, and their incidental connection with a particular pursuit gives it no right to have a special department in the schools; for then all must have such special departments, and thus, too —which is a far worse consequence—all theoretical science, all that is connected with the general culture of the mental functions and the growth of the general intelligence, must be crowded out for that which thus comes in, and so defiantly comes in, under the usurped names of the practical and the useful. In this way the highest utility is in danger of being utterly disregarded, and that most useful scheme of education—most useful as lying at the foundation of everything else—is in danger of being undervalued, broken up and in the end utterly lost. If we will have the one, we must yield to the other; and then surely there arises a problem of utilities, than which there is none more practical, as there can be none more vital in its bearing on our highest good.

What then is to be included in this term education—liberal education? We cannot learn every thing. Life is too short; *Vita brevis; ars longa.* Much we must be wholly ignorant of.

much, in every department, we must take as sheer empiricism. The utmost knowledge of the common school is necessarily very limited. That of the college may excel it in quality, but cannot greatly exceed it as far as mere quantity is concerned. Regarded merely as matter of accumulation, or remembered detail, it is but little that our best educated men carry away with them into subsequent life of the sciences once pursued, unless it may be in some particular branch to which they may have specially devoted themselves. The classical scholar forgets all but the most general principles of the mathematics. The mathematician loses, in a great degree, his actual knowledge of Greek and Latin; but its place in the soul has not become a blank. Far from it. All is not lost that lies out of one's subsequent chosen line of study. The value of scholastic discipline remains in the mental states it has produced, and which no other discipline could have produced. It is still with the man in the change that has passed upon his soul, making it impossible that he should ever be the man he would have been had he never received it. It is still with him, in the elevated view it has given of the general field of knowledge, and in the spiritual power it has created of resuming a familiarity with any one department, or of adding to it any kindred knowledge whenever it may be needed. In the attainment of such a position, knowledge is a means, and not itself the end. In this respect, quality is of more consequence than quantity. There is a vast difference between simply knowing a thing, and knowing it rightly; that is, knowing its true place and comparative value in its relation to other knowledge. Without this, ignorance is the safer, we may even say the higher, as it is the more hopeful state. There may be even an extensive knowledge, but so ill chosen, so out of connection with other departments—of consequence so ill proportioned, so distorted, so one-sided, so falsely magnified or so refracted through false media, as to be actually a source of darkness rather than light.. The light that is in it is darkness —a darkness visible. It increases the soul's ignorance of itself by its accumulation. Its want of harmony with other parts diminishes that highest and most useful power—the power of

estimating aright the comparative value of different kinds of truth. There is much said at the present day of moral courage; courage to think, courage to speak. Perhaps one of the highest exercises of this moral courage would consist in a young man's daring to be ignorant of some things now esteemed a most important part of human knowledge.

What then is liberal education, and what ought to be included in the term? We venture to answer, although in the most general terms: It is that knowledge, and that mental discipline, which pertains to man as man, and which enables him best to perform that work which belongs to him as man, aside from those particular modifications of it which come out of the individual's own peculiar circumstances, calling or pursuit. Knowledge for the first of these ends is liberal education; it is for every man, as far as he has the means of obtaining it. Knowledge for the second is professional training, business training, partial training; it is for some men in distinction from others, to enable them to carry on their own particular job, trade, craft, mystery, or walk in life. The first is for the soul's sake —for the soul's health; the second is for the body in its widest wants, for a livelihood, for wealth, for what is called success in life—in a word, for things wholly unspiritual. There is a perfect analogy here between knowledge as the food of the soul, the bread of life, and the proper material food of the body. Some things we eat are not digested. Some parts of our bodily food pass off without incorporation; other portions enter into the blood; they are transmuted into our very life, and become permanent constituents of our organic personality. So there is a knowledge which is never digested, and never can be digested; it must ever remain crude, raw, fermenting. There is a knowledge which never truly enters into the soul: it lies on the outside; it forms no part, as it was never fitted to form a part, of our mental growth. There is again a knowledge which actually becomes a part of the soul. We speak without a figure here. It is transmuted into something higher than knowledge. We not only know it, but we live it spiritually. It is not a thing used occasionally for occasional purposes, like the outside prac-

tical knowledge not wanted for the soul, but becomes an integral constituent of our spiritual being, never more to be separated. It has changed the man, so that he can never be afterwards what he was before.

We have spoken of the work which belongs to man as man; but is there such a thing, it may be asked, apart from the special individual pursuit of each man, and for which therefore he ought to be specially fitted? Woe to us, if there be not. Alas for our dignity, if "all of life," for us, "be but to live;" if there be not a higher end to which life itself—life present and life to come—be but a means, and that transcending end the culture of the soul in all that is most akin to itself; in all that is least mutable, least transient, least partial; in the knowledge of the necessary and the eternal, the knowledge of things that pass not away. Yes, there is such a work of soul culture as an end in itself. The end of true education, of liberal education, is to enable us first to know, next to appreciate, and then to perform it. To set forth this whole work of man as man, would not only carry us out of our assigned limits, but would far transcend the speaker's power. It would carry us, too, into the domain of theology; for true education is essentially religious. Let us be content, therefore, to take its earthly side. This work of soul culture in our present state is but an *umbra*—a shadow of things belonging to a higher state of being. Plato could see that, when he called the mathematics holy, and reckoned as their high utility, not the measuring of lands on earth, nor even the geocentric survey of the heavens, but the great fact that they brought the soul of the youthful pupil nigh the paradigms of the eternal, and made it familiar with immutable truth. The training we call education may present features very different from those of the everlasting school; but it is allied to it, in that it seeks that knowledge which has most of the abiding element, the least of that "which is ever perishing in the using." It is exceedingly limited and imperfect, because it belongs to earth; but it has the elements of unlimited expansion. It embraces all that is highest and most universal in human relations, and, therefore, has it been

well called *humane*. With diffidence would we attempt to sketch its outlines.

As man, one needs to know, first of all, his relations to his Maker; and next to that, and through that, his relations to his fellow-men. Hence Theology and Ethics are parts, prime parts, of liberal education. He needs, secondly, a knowledge of what his race have been doing in the world, and of God's dealings with them; in other words, History sacred and profane. He wants to know, too, what the most thoughtful souls have thought on the great problems of origin and destiny in respect to man and the world; in other words, the History of Philosophy, and Philosophy itself. He wants to know, all he can know, of the wondrous world within him. Hence Psychology is an indispensable part of liberal education. He needs some knowledge of the wide world without him, in both its aspects, mathematical and physical: the first embracing those varieties of form, number, quantity, ratio, spatial or dynamical, under which matter is ever manifested, and through which, though temporal and finite itself, it is the manifestation or paradigm of the infinite and the eternal; the second embracing those motions and changes that make the domain of physics, wide indeed in its detail, but only belonging to liberal education so far as it connects itself with the catholic thinking, to the exclusion of professional knowledge or the accumulation of curious phenomenal facts. In other words, he needs an acquaintance with Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, including Chemistry, with certain other subdivisions of natural science, which, although they have only in modern times become objects of educational interest, are universal in their connections with our world and race. He needs an acquaintance with language, as the instrument, not merely for the *utterance*, but also for the *rational formation* of thought. With this is connected Philology, or the science of language, as one of the best means of mental discipline, and as opening the most direct avenue to the study of the soul itself, through this its most direct product and representative. He needs, as man, the kindred science of Logic: for its own intrinsic worth, as belonging, like mathe-

matics, to the department of the ever and immutably true; for its general utility, not in the discovery of truth, as its caricaturist would represent, but in its keen and instant detection of that false reasoning from which flow more evils to man than ever came from ignorance of natural knowledge. He needs not only a grammatical and logical acquaintance with language, but also some knowledge of the power of this noble instrument as used for persuasion, for exciting enthusiasm, for humanizing and elevating us in the communication from soul to soul of affection and emotion, as well as truth. Hence Rhetoric and Composition, and Oratory, and Criticism, become essential parts of liberal education. Certain forms and figures of language there are which become the medium through which we are raised above the present moment, made self-forgetful, full of unwonted aspiration; carried out of the temporal, the animal, the partial, into the spiritual, the universal, the eternal, the divine. Hence, for such refinement and exaltation of his humanity, he needs Poetry; that most useful as well as divine art of Poetry, which the clear unemotional intellect of Aristotle declared to be a more "important and a more serious thing than history." He wants not only to feel it, to enjoy it, but to know something about it; to learn the rules that regulate its harmonies, to understand the philosophy of its inspiration. For similar reasons, education embraces an acquaintance with Music, and the kindred arts which connect themselves most directly with the intelligence and common reason, through those most intellectual of the senses, the eye and the ear. Something more might be added, but we have here the outlines of what may be included under the term Liberal Education, as that spiritual culture which is for man as man, whatever may be his special distinctions of condition; and for every man, as far as this short and troubled and much occupied life may yield the means and furnish the motives for its attainment.

Such a scheme is built on what man is in himself—in his own inner world of being. It may be said to rest, too, on the nature of man in his most unchanging and universal relations to things within, beneath, above and around him. As thus growing

out of the human condition, it has heretofore, in all civilized communities, been recognized as presenting the prime elements and main outlines of true scholastic discipline. Hence most of these departments, thus viewed, have been styled "*the humanities;*" and the course combining them has been called Liberal Education—*παιδεία ἐλευθέριος*, as it was named by Aristotle. It is rightly so called, not merely as denoting the education of a freeman, which is one sense, but also as that which tends to *free* the soul from the selfish contracting influence of local, temporal, and partial associations as connected with local and partial pursuits. These, however useful, and even indispensable, do yet require some acquaintance with humane and liberal knowledge, as a corrective of that narrowness, and prejudice, and one-sidedness, which ever result from viewing things in confined and particular situations. It is also *liberal*, because it raises a man out of his low individuality, or individualism, into the freer life of humanity. It brings him into communion with the common educated mind of the race, as represented by that gathered knowledge of past ages which has ever survived the temporary, and which furnishes the only sure ground for the much talked of progress. It lifts him, we may say, out of the Spirit of the Age, which is sometimes a very narrow thing, into the Spirit of the Ages. It guards him against the delusions of the *vox populi*, by tuning his ear to hear, and his heart to understand, the *vox humanitatis;* that "still small voice," which ever remains as the onflowing residuum, after the froth and turbulence, the earthquake, fire and storm of each succeeding age have passed by. Ours, too, will add to that voice, to be heard by the ages that come after us, but in tones subdued, and sounding very differently, it may be, from the near clamor of it that is now ringing in our ears.

Of such a course of education it may be said that it gives a man a command, at pleasure, over much that lies beyond or below it. It places him in a position from which he can overlook the whole field of knowledge, and, any time, stoop down and make himself master of any of the partial or professional sciences whenever needed either as matters of utility or of curious

investigation. He has his foundation; he can build upon it what he pleases.

In fixing the practical outlines of such a scheme of education as may be called fundamental, the greatest difficulty is found in that expansion of physical science which has grown out of the discoveries of modern times. Whilst elsewhere the boundaries are well defined, here it is difficult to prescribe the limits, to separate the fundamental from the partial, the *humane* from what is merely professional, or to be regarded as belonging to particular pursuits. Former ages had less experience of this difficulty, because physical science was so limited. The Greeks had their *physics;* but it consisted of those general questions about nature, motion, force, causation, time and place, that many now would rather style *metaphysics.* What we now call by that name, or natural science in its detail, had hardly any existence among them. They thought more about the cosmology of the universe, than the classification of its parts. Hence what has since almost exclusively usurped the name of science *par excellence*, was hardly entitled to the appellation at all. *Scientia* (ἐπιστήμη) was thought to be correctly predicated only of those truths which were supposed to be fixed, necessary and eternal, the objects of the pure reason, and therefore alone capable of being surely known. The ever flowing phenomena of the material world, being referable to no necessary axioms, were only objects of sense and opinion; scattered facts, constituting *natural history* (the term employed by Aristotle), rather than *natural science.* We plainly see their error, but have gone to the opposite extreme. These things are science, but only so far as they are manifestations of the necessary and the universal, or connect themselves with what is ultimately demanded by the soul's own thinking. So far the old thinkers were right. The fault of our modern Baconian term is that it makes them science almost exclusively, and that too in their most outward and arbitrary aspects. Instead of its old names, *Grammatica*, *Musica*, *Rhetorica*, *Logica*, *Philosophia*, *Ethica*, *Politica*, *Geometrica*, *&c.*, the word science now calls up, in many minds, only the interminable list of the *ologies*, so liberal-

ly introduced into the modern vocabulary; a large portion of which, with all their euphonic titles, are after all but chapters and sections and subdivisions of what is still to be regarded as natural history. Nothing shows more strongly this aspect of very modern times, than the fact that we have dignified with the name of science (not a science, but science pre-eminently) Conchology and Helminthology, the knowledge of shells and worms; whilst Theology, once styled *Regina scientiarum*, is barely admitted, if not wholly tabooed as a mere wrangle about sprinklings and immersions and apostolical successions. If capability of classification, however, is the only test (and that is about as far as some things called science have gone), we may have a science of paving stones as well as of the heavenly bodies.

Our ancestors, doubtless, had views far too limited respecting the importance of the study of nature. We, however, are now running into a worse because a more fundamental error, in giving a preponderance to this physical department, so out of all proportion that it threatens to exclude knowledge more directly connected with the cultivation of the mind, and therefore of far more importance to us as beings destined to survive when the present nature sinks in years, and "like a changed garment" shall be laid aside for more glorious and eternal manifestations of that which can never change. What has been sketched as fundamental, should be regarded as indispensable. This should be preserved at all events in our colleges and higher seminaries. Other things, if there is time for them, or a place can be made for them; but this never to be superseded, if we would not risk the entire loss of the name and of the thing we call Liberal Education.

This part of our subject is full of difficulties. We would, however, venture to maintain, in the most general way, one or two principles on which a tolerably correct classification may be made, and the equilibrium of college education be essentially preserved. And first we say, natural knowledge may be divided into two main departments. One of these only is strictly entitled to the name *science;* the other may more properly be

called, as the ancients called it, *natural history*. However valuable for many purposes the latter may be, it is simply a collection of facts or phenomena, more or less partial, local or temporal, and classified mainly by phenomenal resemblances or differences. They may become scientific; but in their present state, whatever science they may seem to possess is only the application of principles drawn from other departments. We may safely say that a large portion of these must be shut out from a course of liberal education, even when planned upon the largest scale. There is no reason, to say the least, why the minutiæ of Mineralogy and Ichthyology should be crowded into such a course, any more than the chronology or political history of the Esquimaux or the inhabitants of Australia.

It is, doubtless, well to have all the knowledge that can be obtained on these matters stored up somewhere in books or manuscripts, like specimens preserved in the cabinets of the curious, to be used when called for by some partial or professional purpose. Of course, then, some must make these departments their special study; and if so, they should pursue it with enthusiasm. It is well that in some books there should be thus stored away a particular knowledge of all the mosses, all the varieties of seaweed, all the various species of worms and animalcules—if there is any end to them, or if there is not; but it certainly can form no proper part of true scholastic culture, whether in the lower or the higher schools.

What is strictly natural science, presents a higher claim to a place among the *humanities*. Yet even here there is an obvious gradation, grounded on a very clear principle. Those branches of natural science are best entitled to a place in a scheme of liberal education which are the most universal in their phenomena, and most closely connected with the knowledge of the necessary and the eternal; of that which is true in itself as principle, rather than as mere exhibitions of facts or phenomenal law which is nothing more than an outward inductive classification from facts.

Some of these are almost purely science in this highest sense, what there is of them which is merely phenomenal, serving rather as diagrams of higher verities, than as being itself the know-

ledge most desired as an end. Thus Astronomy is entitled to a high place, as being almost purely mathematical, or an exhibition of the eternal verities of mathematical science on the grandest phenomenal scale, and in connection with those laws of motion that rank next to the geometrical axioms in respect to certainty, necessity and universality. It is not merely the magnitude of its phenomena; for there may be more science in a very minute object than in a very large one. There may be more science in a snow-flake than in a mountain. It is not bulk, then, but its connection with those higher truths, those eternal verities, that makes the grandeur of astronomical science. Jupiter, and the satellites of Jupiter, are very glorious objects; but that numerical and dynamical law, that thought of the Infinite Mind, which binds them together, hath "a far more exceeding glory."

On the same ground, Optics would have rank. Any one may see, too, how applicable the principle would be to Mechanics, or that whole science of force which has been styled Dynamics. So too the discoveries of Chemistry are bringing out, more and more, the same connections; and a like position may be taken in respect to the knowledge of those lately examined forces which are denominated Magnetism, Galvanism, and Electricity. The progress of discovery is more and more building out of them a science, not simply of classified phenomena as heretofore, but of those phenomena regarded as exhibitions of eternal, mathematical and dynamical laws.

We have thus some good grounds of discrimination in determining the place of natural science, and the gradations of its parts, in a course of liberal education; although some difficulties must ever remain in the application of the principles. Especially will this be the case in respect to those schools where there can be only time and means for the merest outlines of liberal culture; for we contend that the term *liberal* may apply to the common school as well as to the university. Here but few of the strictly physical sciences can come in. Others, we know, take a directly contrary position. Even in the most elementary schools they would assign the preponderance to

these branches, on the very plausible plea of their being more practical and immediately useful.

We do not intend to rail at utility. Still it may be doubted whether those who use the term most have always a clear idea of what they mean by it. There are different kinds, there are different degrees of utility. There may be also a mistake in regard to what some would style immediate practical results. Let us suppose for example, that in one of our academies, or in one of our better order of common schools, there are two classes pursuing two distinct courses of study. One is mainly devoted to grammar, either of our own or of some other tongue; to some plain system of logic, such as might easily be adapted even to the common school; to rhetoric, composition, the most instructive portions of history; to the daily reading of choice extracts from some of our most classical English authors; to moral philosophy, and some of the most fundamental branches of the pure mathematics. The other, under this common idea of the practical and immediately useful, is mainly occupied with chemistry, geology, mineralogy, botany, physiology, and some of the most practical branches of the mixed mathematics, such as engineering, surveying, etc., learned practically and without the theoretical. Both of these would be extreme. One compounded of the two, would be better than either exclusively. But can there be a rational doubt as to which course would, in the end, make the most practical man; best fit him for the common duties, and common trials of life; give him the largest view of his relations to mankind, the most of those ideas and of that thinking which pertains to our common humanity; or, in short, better prepare him for that work that belongs to man as man (beyond and beside all particular occupations), and which he was sent here by his Maker to perform? Which of these two courses would be most effectual towards producing that most *useful* result, a symmetrical mental character; or which, on the other hand, would be most likely to turn out a one-sided man, with a one-sided knowledge adapted, perhaps, though in a very limited degree, to partial and immediate purposes, yet, on this account, taking away from the mind's general power, and

distorting its general vision? When the question is thus stated, what thinking mind can hesitate in giving the only true answer?

We have supposed that the immediate practical results, in the latter case, do truly turn out to be such as were designed or expected; but this is far from being certain. Experience as a teacher has convinced the writer that on no studies is time generally wasted to so little purpose, as on those that are pursued in reference to immediate practical utility. There is something in the very nature of such a course leading to the neglect of theoretical knowledge, and, of course, the practical and empirical knowledge acquired is superficial and inaccurate. It is too limited for the purpose intended, and deficient in the requisite stimulus. Boys can never be made to study from such a motive of after utility. With young men in college, it is but a feeble incitement to close application. Nothing will do here until the soul is, somehow, awakened to the love of knowledge *per se*, and that demands, for the moment, forgetfulness of all things else. New discoveries, or new applications of them to the practical arts, are seldom made except by those who have a passionate fondness for the science involved in them, contemplated under its theoretical aspect. Notwithstanding what is said about the impulse given to scientific discovery since Bacon taught that utility was its grand aim (a thing by the way, that Bacon never did teach), it can be most abundantly shown that the largest additions of new and useful truths have been made by men who were the devoted lovers of science for its own sake, acting under the influence of this higher stimulus, and without a thought of utility. Science has thus ever been, and ever will be, most truly useful when regarded by its enthusiastic votaries as most purely theoretical; that is, most purely science. Its spirit will die out; it will be no longer useful, no longer practical; it will be effete and barren of new discoveries: progress will have come to a standstill, when false views of education have tended to make science wholly practical and utilitarian, in its moving aims as well as in its economical results. The history of scientific discovery would most abundantly prove this, paradoxical as it may appear.

Even here, too, there is a necessary gradation. There are two classes of scientific men: those in whom the theoretical is predominant, and even exclusive; and those who indeed love science for its own sake, but in whom the practical talent is the chief characteristic. The latter class is valuable; the first is indispensable. The men of pure science are the deep fountains of all utilities, high and low; the other class are the conduits by which they are diffused through practical life. The scientific *genius* of a Newton or a Davy must precede the practical *talent* of a Watt or a Stephenson, a Fulton or a Morse. Thus what proceeds from the sage in his closet or his laboratory—the offspring of pure mind abstracted from the world and all its utilities, and thinking only of science as science—becomes afterwards matter of practical application, and, being thus transmuted, passes into the common mind, and is added to the common stock of practical knowledge. We cannot change this course, this gradation that nature has established, by any hot-bed forcing process that would convert our colleges into machine shops, or chemical manufactories of gas. There is an amount of chemistry that belongs to the college, as a part of general knowledge which should be known by every educated man, and without which he cannot be said to be liberally educated. All beyond that, belongs to those who have an enthusiastic fondness for it, and mean to devote their lives to its pursuit. These will obtain their end, under the high stimulus aforesaid; but their number is necessarily very small. To make all educated men such, is an impossibility; whilst the amount of chemical knowledge rightly proportioned to a college course, though it may stimulate some to a farther and more devoted pursuit of this noble science, is, in itself, and from the very necessity of the case, too general for immediate practical results.

But could they be easily and universally acquired, are these practical studies really as useful, even for the ordinary life, as some that for their sake would be thrown out of our schools? Take chemistry again, the best of them all: it is the one most frequently cited by our practical men. Its applications to the arts and manufactures are enlarged upon. Illustrations are

given. It helps us to analyze bad brandy; it enables us to detect the deceptions of quacks; it discovers poisons that may be lying in our food. What can be more useful than this? Logic, on the other hand, is regarded by very many as comparatively useless. It is merely the knowledge of words, say they, and of scholastic trifles. No man at present employs logic to discover truth; the laboratory and the crucible are now employed for that purpose. Since Bacon's time, says every itinerant lecturer, we interrogate nature, instead, of trifling with syllogisms. Now no thinking man would maintain that the office of logic was the direct discovery of truth; but it is certainly of highest value as a detector of the false in speech and thought, even as chemistry is a detector of the false in nature. Our age, it is true, abounds in quacks in the common usage of the term; and there is, therefore, great value in that noble science which enables us to detect their colorless nostrums. But are there not quacks and quackeries political, quacks theological, quacks social, quacks literary, quacks editorial? Their quackeries meet us in speeches from our legislative halls; in the resolutions, false or meaningless, of public meetings. They abound in the newspapers, in public lectures; they pour as legions from the teeming press. Instead of bad brandy, then, let us take for analysis some public speech by which the mind of the hearers may have been greatly swayed. It swarms in fallacies. It abounds, not simply in misrepresentations, but in gross errors of reasoning, arising either from ignorance or design. But these fallacies are dispersed through many columns; they float concealed in a colorless solvent holding in solution almost every sophism of thought and language. The premises are very far from the conclusion, and between them intervenes a deluding mass of declamation; both causes prevent that detection of the main sophism which would, at once, arise from bringing them into immediate contiguity, as is the office of the syllogism to do. The middle term, whose soundness is the conservative element of the whole reasoning, is used in various senses, or it has more meaning in one place than in another, so that in fact there are several middle terms, and several argu-

ments wrapped in one; but these various senses are far apart; one is lost sight of before the other is reached, or it is obscured by the intervening matter which the blundering of the speaker, or the misled fancy of the hearer, has introduced. In this way, a most false conclusion is palmed upon us as following from the most indisputable premises. This is especially the case when the speaker makes much show of a false logical lingo, abounds in "wherefores" and "therefores," talks much about his "premises," tells us continually that "it follows" so and so, when nothing follows but a string of non-sequiturs from end to end. This was the style, not so much declamatory as pretentiously logical, by which Calhoun juggled his hearers, and got with many the name of the great logician. Such truly *was* his eminent Northern rival, who had too much sound logic to introduce into his speeches that technical logical language which belongs, not to the orator, but to the critical analyst of his discourse.

In perusing such a speech as we have described, the reader often feels that there is a gross fallacy somewhere, but he is unable to lay his finger upon it; or he may be wholly carried away by disguised sophistry. Now how important the knowledge, or rather the mental discipline, which enables us to bring such a pretended argument into its true syllogistic form, to reduce every word to its precise sense, to bring every proposition to its true place in relation to every other, to strip off all its irreverent patchwork, to bind together into one near view the widely dispersed assertions that enter into its middle term (or terms), to detect by such contiguity its disguised or double senses, to bring by such a marshalling the premises face to face with the conclusion, and thus to precipitate at once the poisonous error before diffused through this deceptive compound, and as readily too as the chemical test precipitates the poisonous ingredient in the quack's health-destroying nostrum. There is such a science; there is such an art: for it is both a science and an art. It should be taught early and thoroughly in our schools. A man may forget its rules, its technical language may be lost; but the discipline of mind it hath given, the critical analyzing faculty, these remain and enable him to perform

for himself, and for others, this office never more needed than at the present day.

In view of every aspect of things around us, who can overestimate the immense *practical utility* of having the common mind everywhere accustomed to some degree of logical analysis, to strict verbal definition, and to a detection of those fallacies that result from that most common offence, the gross abuse of language? And yet very many, even of those claiming to be educational authorities among us, would rank it among the comparatively useless branches. The present age, say they, is preeminently practical: it demands the knowledge of *things;* the world has long enough been occupied with *words.* It demands useful knowledge, as distinguished from useless logical or verbal investigations, or, as they would contemptuously style it, the subtleties of the schools. A melancholy experience of errors, social, moral, and religious, may yet convince us that *words* are very important *things;* and that the analysis of words and propositions may be far more useful and practical, at certain times, than that of earths and alkalis. He who should reduce to their elemental ideas, and thus clearly define, such words as nature, supernatural, law, development, idea, life, organic, power, force, faculty, government, state, church, morality, religion, duty, crime, punishment, reformation, liberty, will, necessity, cause, effect, reason, motive, right as an adjective, right as a noun, with many other similar words that now pass about like defaced and worn-out coins; he who would stamp them all anew, and so bring out their true and ancient image, the same and immutable under all abuse, making them so clear to the popular mind that every counterfeit would be instantly detected, and all false traffic in this precious currency rendered an impossibility; such a man, we say, would confer a favor upon our age of more value than the most splendid discoveries of modern science.

The progress in physical knowledge fills up that department in the general scheme of education, in which former ages were so deficient. Still the limited time allotted to our primary schools requires that there should be a limited selection, cor-

responding best to that governing idea which has been presented of the proper culture of the mind. Instead, then, of the present rage for the physical sciences, to the exclusion of almost everything else; instead of smatterings of botany and mineralogy; instead of "child's books on physiology," having just enough to make them the dupes of every quackish lecturer who chooses to adopt a scientific jargon, and accounts for every thing by electricity; instead of this, or along with some of this if it must be so, let history and language and logic, and some of the plainer branches of the pure mathematics, have a space bearing some proportion to their importance, even in our common schools. Let English grammar, accompanied with the analysis of words in our own language, be studied long and thoroughly. Let a considerable portion of the time devoted to common school education be occupied with the daily reading and critical study of selections from our most choice English classics. If the poor man's child must remain ignorant of some branches of physical science, or know nothing of Shakespeare and Milton, by all means let the first be sacrificed. Let something be done, during this brief period, for even the most lowly, towards elevating their thoughts and tastes above the hard practical drudgeries with which they will become familiar enough in after life. If it be, indeed, but a very short time they can devote to knowledge, let that knowledge be of the purest kind, knowledge most intimately connected with the soul and its noblest tastes, knowledge that shall enter into the spiritual life, and be the spirit's remembered solace amid the depressing toils of after days. A precious season this, the very few years of the poor child's schooling! Let us see to it that it be filled with what is most precious in thought, and in its after power upon the soul. Let us not, under the pretence of what we call "immediate practical utility," be so cruel as to give them, for their daily reading books, miserably composed works on the ordinary economies of life, or selections from town laws or from revised statutes that hardly last some half dozen of years until they are revised again; or newspapers, as some would recommend; or such quackish things as Combe's Constitution of

Man, instead of the choicest extracts from Addison and Blair and Johnson and Milton, from Burke and Beattie, Pope and Goldsmith; from Spenser, Cowper, Thomson, Young; from Coleridge, Scott and Burns: books from which thousands, even in humblest life, have received elevation of taste, purity of conception, command of language, appreciation of sound reasoning; a *feeling*, at least, of the power that is in well-chosen words even if there was not received all the rich fullness of that import which they carry to minds of higher cultivation. Children do not understand such books, it is said: let the teacher then patiently fill up the mind's vacancy. But they do understand more than we think. There is a spirit in good words that will not lie dormant: they will quicken the spirit into which they enter, even without outward instruction; they will be *felt*, at least as something rich and excellent; they will beget a taste to meet their excellence; and especially will they, in after life, come up again, and bring with them a new life, a new impress to the faded forms that had long years ago been planted in the memory. Give them children's books, if we would ever keep them children; give them what are called practical books, or business books, if we would ever keep their souls in the same poor barren state to which poverty or toil condemns their outward lives. But it would be better to imitate the wise and truly practical Greeks in this thing, and especially in the method by which was imparted to their youth so much of their peculiar national character. Let it be a standing practice in our common schools to commit to memory choice portions from our best writers, and especially from the poets, as being that which will lie nearest to the heart and deepest in the remembrance. Much is said in sermons, and in lectures, against the bad influence of what is called the light and corrupt literature of the day. If we would keep this out, let the soul be preoccupied with something better. The young man, or woman, whose mind has been deeply, if not extensively, affected by the ideas and language of the authors just mentioned, will have little relish for much of the quackery and trash now everywhere streaming from the press.

These remarks apply with still greater force to colleges. There have sprung up of late, in almost all our higher seminaries, what are called partial courses. They are favored as most popular, most practical, and most immediately connected with the business of after life. They generally embrace, in largest proportion, the physical sciences, to the neglect of other departments belonging to the essential idea of liberal education. Now it may be a serious question whether they secure, to any desirable extent, even the poor and partial end at which they aim, and for which so much that is fundamental has to be sacrificed. Permit the writer to give his own thirty years' experience as a teacher here. It is decidedly to the effect, that college students on a partial course of this kind are not, in general, so well acquainted even with their own chosen branches, as those who have connected with them other studies deemed fundamental in a general course. There has been obtained a more solid acquaintance even with natural science and the mixed mathematics, and especially a better appreciation of those aspects that connect them with the whole field of knowledge, by young men who have been steadily pursuing, at the same time, the old course of classical, philosophical, and pure mathematical study. Here, also, may there be presented to our practical men the same test as before, and on their own vaunted ground of practical utility. Let the experiment be fairly tried with a dozen young men drilled for four years, mainly, in the philological, the logical, the moral, the metaphysical, the historical and mathematical sciences, together with what is generally known as the belles-lettres. Let the same number, during the same period, be occupied with those physical branches that have usurped to themselves, almost exclusively, the names of the scientific and the practical. With the utmost confidence would we abide the resulting test that would settle the question, which of the two courses proposed would turn out the most truly practical men, most efficient, best qualified to act their parts among men in all the moral, social and political relations of life.

A person once told me, by way of derision, that the course of studies in Trinity College, Dublin, was nothing but a round

of Greek, Geometry and Logic, and Geometry, Logic and Greek, and Logic, Greek and Geometry. This was, of course, a caricature; and yet if these prime studies denoted a well-proportioned course in those departments of the classical, the mathematical and the philosophical, of which they might be taken as the representatives, it was admirably adapted to produce a strong man among men, even though he may have had a very limited knowledge of the details of physical science. We know that there are strong men who have been made otherwise; and that there are weak men, far too many, who have been sent from our colleges. Horace Greeley is a specimen of the first kind; but even he would admit, we think, that he has grown stronger, and less one-sided, in proportion as he has given himself, in his reading, to this general culture. Knowing his own strength, he may with some reason feel proud of his superiority to many who are said to be liberally educated; but the number of those to whom he can thus point would, doubtless, have been much less, had our colleges rigidly adhered to the old scholastic method, instead of breaking up their strength in these partial and purely physical courses. Chemistry and Zoology would never have made the Editor of the Tribune. And so we may say of Franklin, that though electricity, as an incidental pursuit, added to his fame, it neither made his mental strength, nor formed an essential part of his mental culture. It was his study of the humanities, his close reading of the best English literature, the persevering pains he took to form his own excellent style by writing over the choicest papers of Addison, that made a man who was by nature strong still stronger in that power of thought and clear expression which gave him such a command over other minds.

But would you exclude instruction in partial sciences, for partial and professional pursuits? By no means. Let every one get all the knowledge and skill he can according to his opportunities, and in every way he can that will not interfere with the acquisition of that which is fundamental. All that is meant is that these things do not come under the general idea of Liberal Education. They belong to the training or vocation

of the individual in his individuality; and for their better acquisition, if necessary, let special institutions and apparatus be provided. The State, too, may encourage them as it encourages farriery or the making of chemicals, or any kind of useful manufacture. But we protest against unsettling an established idea, and introducing into a long established word a license of meaning to which, when once begun, we can affix no limit.

The amount of it all is this: We must be men, and know what pertains to men as men, however limited and rudimentary the knowledge, before we are merchants or mechanics or farmers. According to this view, the college should be the expansion of the common school, only presenting the same idea under a higher and wider aspect. What we have styled the humanities should be the main teaching in both, although in the latter they may exist in their most rudimentary state. The wide university course of pure mathematics, for example, has as its representative in these primary departments, the study of numbers, with such advance in algebra and geometry as time will allow. Here too, the theoretical should be primary, if it were only to secure the soundest practical. Arithmetic will be useful to the boy, of course; but its utilities in keeping accounts and making money should not be incessantly dinned into his ears. Let him have the charm of pure knowledge, the delight of pure wonder as the wide unknown is opening before him. Tell him that in these prime properties of numbers which are now unfolding themselves *to* his mind, or rather *within* his mind, there are contained the seeds of infinite truths; and thus give him the highest and purest stimulus, though faint perhaps his grasp of what you mean. To proceed with with our parallel: Mental Philosophy, Moral Philosophy and Theology, as taught in the humbler school, may be represented in the Bible, the Catechism, and such well selected reading lessons as, along with excellence of style, should impart some knowledge of our wondrous human nature, in connection with those mysteries of our being that come to the mind of the musing child—oftener, it may be, than to the hard and worldly man. Philology should be represented by the study of the grammar of our own tongue. The scien-

tific Logic of the higher schools might here exist in the form of an accurate analysis of all our more usual moral, political, and theological terms. The Rhetoric and Belles-lettres of the University might have their typical rudiments in the practice, before mentioned, of committing to memory select stores from our most clasical prose writers and poets. The universal history of the one might be the epitome of the other. And thus, if we might bring in some of the most instructive lessons from nature in their most universal aspects, the common school becomes the rudimentary college, looking to the same end, and the same idea of universal, humane, or liberal education.

One aspect of professional study may, perhaps, be entitled to exception from the foregoing conclusions. What are styled "the learned professions," namely, of Law, Medicine, and Theology, were in former times regarded as part of the general culture of the mind (and thus far liberal), rather than as ministerial or strictly professional. This latter aspect seems now to have become predominant; and yet, even as studies peculiar to distinct callings, they have more connection with general knowledge, more to do with man as man, or with humanity in its most universal estimate, than other seemingly partial pursuits. They embrace the three widest relations: of man to his Maker; of man to his fellow-men; of man to the world of matter, through his own material organization. The knowledge, therefore, peculiar to them runs through the three grand departments of political, religious, and natural philosophy. Hence there is, in the very nature of things, a ground for the distinction and preëminence which have given them this long established title of "the learned and liberal professions." They had, too, this name of liberal, because, until near our own times, the requital for their services was regarded as coming from the voluntary sense of honor, rather than from any stipulation of price or fee. The attorney might have his taxable costs, the Apothecary his bill of items; but the learned Counsellor, and the learned Physician, never sold knowledge. However liberal the donations received, they were supposed to be a grateful testimonial for benefits whose value could not be estimated in

money. Times have changed in this respect, yet still do these professions hold their place above others. Long may they be protected from the influence of that degrading view, which, as held even by some professedly within their own pale, would actually make them mere trades, instead of elevated and honorable offices connected with the highest responsibilities. There is reason to fear this, from the growing tendency to divest them of all science, and thus reduce them to the merest empiricisms. When this is effected, they become the narrowest and the meanest of all pursuits, simply because in that state they are base counterfeits of the highest and noblest knowledge.

What is the relation, now, of education and the educated man to the State? The answer to this question will be determined by the view we take of the civil organism, or our answer to those other questions, What is the State itself; and what are its legitimate powers? In relation to our present subject, the latter inquiry presents itself under two aspects: 1. Can the State educate at all? 2. Can the State properly give aid to any other than the common primary schools? In other words, Can it rightly aid institutions designed to furnish an education which, in the very nature of things, cannot be had by all? The affirmative of the first question is, at present, assumed without discussion. The answer to the second depends on the still further inquiry, What is the object of education? Is the man educated for himself alone, or for the good of the organic body of which he is a member? If for himself, then, as far as public aid is concerned, there would be some reason in the assertion of equal individual rights, and in the cry—all or none. In determining this we must aim at having right views, first of the nature of education; and, secondly, of the relation which the man, whether partially or liberally educated, bears to the commonwealth, or common weal. The first has been already discussed, and it is easy to see with what view of the State it connects itself. So also that notion of education which regards each man as educated for himself, draws with it a peculiar theory of the civic *whole*, and of the relations of its parts. The *mass*, we should rather say; for this view regards

the State, not as a whole, properly, whose members by their harmonious relations to the social unity are, at the same time, "members one of another," but rather as a collection of separate interests, brought together by the pressure of circumstances; like forces held in contiguity by an outside mechanical constraint, rather than an inward all-pervading life. It is the Hobbean theory of society as a dissocial peace, or rather armed armistice; a Babel of jarring pursuits, with an ever restless jealousy of partial privileges, a never-ceasing apprehension of rights invaded, a tormenting fear of monsters whom one portion are ever employing to devour the liberties of others.

In preserving such a forced equilibrium, the grand aim is ever to array class against class, the poor against the rich, the farmer against the merchant, the country against the city, the laborer against the capitalist, the uneducated against the educated. There is manifested a dislike to all professions which, in consequence of requiring a higher and a rarer knowledge, do necessarily elevate those who are engaged in them somewhat above other portions of the community. Hence the hostility to the bar, at least in the higher and now almost obsolete sense of a cultivated class of men who devote themselves to the law for its "excellent learning," as a quaint old lawyer calls it. In the wake of this comes opposition to the bench, as a grave, and learned, and permanent body. Hence, too, a dislike of the more scientific medical practice. It is an all-pervading spirit of distrust and suspicion. It has no idea of the State as an organic body, in which the members have their value, and their truest individual well-being in their proper relation to the whole; where whatever is high is for the elevation of the whole, and whatever is strong is for the stability of the whole, and whatever is most sound is for the health of the whole, and whatever is most learned is for the enlightenment of the whole.

It is from this idea of the State as a *mass* made up of masses, where each part is for itself, comes this talk about rights, and the favoring of the few at the expense of the many. Those who are governed by it cannot think of higher and

lower, or of degrees in education, without the thought of degradation and injustice. They cannot understand how a superiority in a *part* may be for the highest good of the *whole*, and even of the inferior portion itself, so as actually to be the necessary antecedent to its elevation. They cannot understand how there can be an education which, although of individuals, in whatever way selected, is yet for the State, and may therefore be truly said to be an education of the State, or, in this sense, an education of all. In other words, they cannot conceive of a knowledge which is for the whole, and therefore of the whole, and from which, as from a common treasury most availably deposited in certain individual minds, the mental and moral health of the whole may be better conserved, than by any unavailing efforts to make such an absolute equalization as nature, and the God of nature in His wisdom and benevolence to mankind, never intended should exist.

Put all this into its proper language, and it reads thus: Unless all men can be lawyers, there shall be no State-patronized means for securing any special qualifications in this respect; in other words, there shall be no lawyers, of course no bench, and even no law worthy of the name. Unless every empiricism that does not even dare to call itself science, has equal patronage, there shall be no public encouragement given to the teaching of that medical system which builds carefully on the slow inductions of ages, and which, therefore, with its imperfections, is the only one that a man can rationally trust. But no, say they, there must be no discrimination; the moment it is made, you trample on somebody's rights. We see here what an evil may come from an error in logic, or even in grammar, we might say. Few things have done more mischief in the world, than this substitution of the noun "*right*" (the individual claim to have what any one else has) for the adjective "*right*," or that which is *right* in itself, as being the best thing for the general good. The public funds must not be given at all, or they must be given to all alike: to every quack who vends a pill, to every juggling professor of clairvoyance, to every empirical dealer in roots; for have they not all their rights—

each one the same right to sell his short individual experience, as that other man whose "book-learning," as they call it, is simply the gathered inductive experience of the centuries since the days of Hippocrates?

Utterly different is the idea of that coherent organism where nothing is regarded as designed for itself alone; and where, of course, when *fully* realized (which we admit is never done in this imperfect world), there can be no selfish jealousy in respect to individual rights; where variety is admitted, not as inferiority, but as the only condition on which there can be true cohering unity; and where there is found, in the well-attempered relations of parts and interdependence of rights, its strength, its consistence, and, as a necessary consequence, its highest well-being. That master limner, Aristotle, has well sketched the opposite view, and drawn its character at a stroke. "It is," says he, speaking of some in his day who would make society a stagnant level of individual rights; it is as though an ignorant musician should reduce a symphony to a flat and tuneless homophony, or attempt to construct a rhythm from syllables all of the same tone and quantity." Each tone, each syllable, would have its right; but what wretched music would be the result!

A kindred fallacy may be detected in that word which some are so fond of using—"the people." They employ it, not as denoting collectively all the members and departments of which the body politic is composed, but some imaginary interest different from all the varied classes, pursuits, and professions. Lawyers are not "people"; neither are physicians, nor clergymen. The rich are not people; nor landlords; nor, in fact, any who own more of the soil than others. So also judges are not people, nor legislators. In the same way would they regard men of education, and all who are specially devoted to learning, science, or literature. All these, and many more, form classes distinct from the people. They stand by themselves; and the people are to keep watch of them with the utmost jealousy, as possessing adverse interests, as their oppress-

ors, their enemies, ever ready to destroy their rights and liberties.

Inequalities of condition are not inequalities of right, in the true sense of the term. In monarchical or aristocratical states, there is danger of such differences becoming personally fixed and permanent; in which case they are a disease in the body politic, tending to rigidity and death. They become real "privileged classes." Hence what is the sheerest demagoguism here, may be sound patriotism, and sound philanthropy, in political organisms so differently constituted. It requires but little observation to see that with us there can be nothing fixed in these distinctions of occupation and pursuit. Their continual flowing is, at the same time, a cause and an effect of political health. Those who at one period have a position in any way raised above the common level are ever—either themselves or their near posterity—falling into and blending with the mass, whilst others are every moment taking their places. It is the inequality of the fresh moving wave, not of the rigid death-bound iceberg. The healthy diversities are constant; the individual parts are ever flowing. There is ever height, and ever lowliness; yet nothing to prevent the one from falling, nothing that can say to the other, thou shalt not rise. And this may be called the very soul of the body politic. The living *form* remains; the *matter* is ever changing. Thus it is that in our happily tempered institutions, classes and varieties and ideas essential to the general coherence and organic well-being may maintain a healthy permanence, resisting the tendency to an utter democratic fluidity on the one hand, and to an entailed aristocratic rigidity on the other; yet still the waters of life flow on; the individual parts ever rising and sinking, now on the topmost swell, and again descending, waning, disappearing, until lost in the lowest strata of society: —

> ut unda impellitur unda,
> Tempora sic fugiunt pariter, pariterque sequuntur,
> Et nova sunt semper.
>
> As wave by wave is driven on, so pass
> The flowing times; forever still the same,
> And yet forever new.

So that the children of the present wealthy may be among the poorest of a following generation; and the descendants of those who are now called the learned, may receive, as their highest education, the instructions of the lowest common school.

It is a favorite position with some, that all educational appropriations should be for the education of "the people," in their imaginary use of the term. They will talk of the common schools as the people's schools, and contend that to them alone the legislature should extend its aid. They alone are for the community; the others for separate interests. Now we maintain that academies and colleges are for the people, as much as the common schools. They are for all in the highest sense, on the ground that their benefits do mediately and ultimately reach all classes. In whatever free community—and we mean by this one in which the healthy flow above mentioned is unimpeded—the colleges and academies are well sustained, made what they ought to be, there the common school flourishes of course. In whatever towns and counties of our State the influence of these higher institutions is most felt, or in other words in whatever places there reside the greatest number of men liberally educated, such as lawyers who have indeed made law a science, and learned clergymen, and scientific physicians, or unprofessional persons of liberal culture, *there* will there be a superior order of common schools. Where this is not the case, money lavished upon them by the State is about thrown away.

But, again, these higher institutions are for all, in another sense, than that of mediate influence. They are for all in the universality of the offer. Their benefits are offered to all, on the lowest possible terms that will requite the division of labor necessarily demanded for the higher instruction. But the poor, it may be said, cannot afford this expense; and, therefore, they are as much shut out as though they had been expressly prohibited. How, then, it may well be asked, are they to be made accessible to greater numbers, and to those of scantier means? There is but one answer to this. It must be by the bounty of the rich, or by legislative aid. Does any one imagine that any

college in this State is making dividends? In such a state of things, then, the public bounty enables them to reduce their average charges, or maintain them at a rate which will render the benefit accessible to a greater number. If even with this it cannot be extended to all, is that a reason why it should not be placed within the reach of as great a number as possible? Did demagoguism, then, ever before so stultify itself, as when it characterized such grants as taking money from the poor to give it to the rich? It is this simple principle, too, that gives us a safe legislative rule in determining the judiciousness of each grant. If such appropriation will enable a college to make a *pro rata* reduction of its charges, then *give:* if it will only go to relieve prior embarrassments, or to pay debts which never should have been contracted—then *withhold.*

But even with such aid, and to the extent too of making full pecuniary provision for the highest education of every child included in the census, can all be thus educated? This is the practical question for practical men. Common sense, and a common knowledge of mankind, at once answer in the negative. There are many other impediments beside the want of money. Only a minor portion can ever, under present circumstances, as we find them in this brief busy existence of ours, be instructed, to any available purpose, in the higher departments of learning and science. Thousands have not the capacity—no place for holding this precious treasure; thousands have not the time; thousands have not the inclination; thousands who have the pecuniary means, prefer the acquisition of wealth and pleasure; and many thousands must, from the very structure of society, be engaged in pursuits, most useful and therefore most honorable, yet wholly inconsistent with that devotion of time which any respectable attainments in science demand. Let education, therefore, be free in the freest sense; let the doors of our institutions be thrown open to the widest extent; let there be even agents and runners sent forth into the highways and byways, to urge them to come in: still we doubt if the halls of science would be filled to overflowing. A very large portion of mankind—sad as we think it—must, and ever

will, receive the benefits of learning, science, and philosophy, mediately through others, who, according to the truest idea of education, are educated, not for themselves, but for that well-harmonized body of which, in the good providence of God, and in a most important sense, they become the seeing, reflecting, and reasoning members—the eye, the ear, the brain, to guide the energies of the hands.

A portion educated for the sake of the many! All this, it may be said, is at war with "the genius of our institutions," to use a favorite phrase. If this be so, then is it all the worse for "the genius of our institutions." We must repeat it: there is need of such a class of well-cultivated minds, to prevent knowledge from becoming superficial in its tendency to popularization, and thus to make it actually more available to practical ends and the practical well-being of society, than could be done by any futile attempts to impart the same knowledge, as a *right*, to all. None have a deeper interest in the true view of this matter, than those whom the demagogue is so fond of styling "the people"; or, in other words, the great body of those whom the common and indispensable vocations of life necessarily exclude from the more difficult departments of knowledge. Should the anti-college feeling ever become predominant, none would, eventually, be greater sufferers by its vandalism, than those very classes whose jealousies it so studiously attempts to excite.

The practical questions, then, for practical men, we say again, are these: 1. Can all, or a majority, or even a fair minority of men, give that attention to science and philosophy which are demanded for them, in order to be available for any important ends? 2. Is there any other probable way of truly elevating and enlightening the masses,* except through the influence of those who, at any one time, constitute the liberal-

* We have used the word *masses* several times in this discourse, but it has been in deference to the common language. We exceedingly dislike the word, as a low one to apply to human beings, and as coming from that false view of the State as a mere gathering of individuals. *Members* and *membership* would be the terms demanded by the other idea of the State as an organic body.

ly educated class? The number of these will doubtless increase with the advance of society; but it is their influence which must contribute to swell their own numbers (thus ever creating both the demand and the supply), whilst, in so doing, it tends in the same ratio to elevate all below it.

This increase and elevation, arising from the steady action and reaction aforesaid, may go on, until, perhaps, in some future golden age, the body politic may have become all eye, all ear, all mind, with hand and feet, and every inferior member, forever dispensed with; constituting a period of intellectual glory, when men will have nothing to do but to think, and hold high debate on all imaginable questions; but it certainly is not so now, and will not be so, perhaps, for many generations to come. The bodily wants require too much attention. The physical world is yet so hostile, and man so morally depraved, that certain physical and social duties must yet occupy no small portion of this troubled season of probation. But could it be attained on earth, and in the body, it might even then be doubted whether for us, as still mortal and evil, such a universal *lumen siccum*, or "dry light," instead of being the highest good, would not rather tend to turn away the soul from the appreciation of that which is far above knowledge, and which, whilst accessible to all, as much transcends the merely intellectual, as the latter rises above the animal enjoyments of our nature.

But this is taking us out of our course. Whatever may be the future state of things, it is, certainly, among us, at the present day, highly desirable that many more should be liberally and thoroughly educated, than now enjoy that blessing. There are, and have been, "practical men" in plenty. "By their fruits we know them." It is not venturing much to say that a few more bookworms, and pedants even, would do the State no harm. We need more thinking men to mix, here and there, with the clamorous crowd of the practical. Or, to sum it all up, we need a more numerous class of persons learned, philosophical, and made familiar with those prime truths, which, although as old as philosophy, require a special exam-

ination in every age; because they are the very ones, in assailing which, the superficial agitator exhibits his individualizing spirit. It requires the simplicity and common sense of thorough learning, to resist successfully this quackery, claiming to be so new and so transcendental. So, too, the true scholar, notwithstanding he may be sometimes charged as having an unsocial spirit, has, after all, more feeling with and for "the masses," than those who would assume their exclusive guardianship. The reason is, that the more thorough and liberal a man's education, the more he is drawn out of himself, or out of his individualism, into a community of thought and feeling with the sober reasoning humanity of all ages. As this was the leading idea with which our article commenced, there is no one better adapted to its close. "No man liveth for himself." The Apostle's maxim has its highest realization in the Church. It may also be taken as the life principle of all true human society, and hence the ground of all liberal education.

Art. II.—IMAGE AND LIKENESS.

BY REV. C. Z. WEISER, A. M.

The commentator, minister and catechist, together with the diligent student and devout reader of the Mosaic record of the creation of Man, find themselves in a *dilemma*, in acquiescing either in the oneness or duality of the terms—"image" and "likeness."

To maintain that they are identical, is to convict the inspired narrative of a tautology, in no wise complimentary; whilst, to endeavor to discover their essential difference, may prove a task, easy enough for the metaphysician, who sometimes seems to delight in uttering a saying which neither he nor others can understand, but is attended with no little difficulty for the pivot-man, who would instruct the simple and edify himself.

Even the controverting of both views, and the choosing of a

middle way, by which the term "likeness" is taken as merely *explanatory* of "image," does not conduct us so smoothly into the domain of clear conviction, after all, since, according to the Septuagint and Vulgate, at least, the troublesome little particle, "*and*," intervenes. It is no little annoying, indeed, to find acknowledged authorities either ignoring the *hiatus*, or bridging it over after such trestle-work style, as to awaken at once an elephantine timidity in the inquirer, lest the flimsy structure might not bear either his or its weight.

It is as well, perhaps, to have the two accepted Readings before us:

King James's Version: LET US MAKE MAN IN OUR IMAGE, AFTER OUR LIKENESS.

The Vulgate rendering: LET US MAKE MAN TO OUR IMAGE AND LIKENESS.

That the true sense of the Divine saying has continued in a sort of ecclesiastical Chancery, from the earliest age of the Christian Church, at all events, until now, after the manner of the famous *Homo-ousian* and *Homoi-ousian,* during the fourth century, will readily appear from a survey of the historical chain of comment wound around it, and which we purpose to uncoil. Nor do we think ourselves open to the charge of dragging the channel of but a shallow and pearl-less stream, at best, since all Christian teachers cannot but feel some concern for the actual depth and compass of man's peculiar prerogative—created in the image and likeness of God.

Commencing with the inspired Word itself, as the most ancient and sole archives of his origin, it is only necessary to remark, that the manner in which the history of his creation is related, and subsequently referred to in the Pentateuch, together with the later occasional allusions made by Prophet, Psalmist and Evangelist, all indicate something peculiar and eminent in the being formed. We look in vain, however, for anything marked, beyond a reciting of the factors which combined in the formation of his God-built constitution—"dust" and "the breath of life." The former element, with the latter breathed over and into it, resulted in the wonderful product—

"a living soul"—MAN, in the image and likeness of his Maker. In reference to what we may call the chemistry of his natural and moral constitution, the Divine Record is wholly silent. It is only as we advance downward, and away from the period in which the last of the inspired Writers closed the Book, that we find any attempt made to construct a Christian anthropology, embracing the science of man's nature in reference to the "image" and "likeness" of God, as residing either here or there, or throughout his whole being.

The *post*-Apostolic teachers only, do we find to venture upon this problem. But as even their courage waxeth bold, as it were, in proportion as they stand away from the primitive period of Revelation, the Apostolical Fathers may be regarded as timid and as cautious as their immediate predecessors had been. It is only from a very faint hinting at a possible anthropomorphism, that anything may be gathered from them on the subject. We are therefore obliged to move a little further onward still, in order to an intelligent prosecution of our investigation.

Justin Martyr, in the former half of the second century, dwells on the Divine image in man, and extends it both to his soul and body, without, however, informing us, what portion of his being the "image" is to be considered as covering, on the one hand, and the "likeness," on the other. He thinks it derogatory both to God and man, to exclude the body of man from all claim to a divine resemblance, since the fleshly framework had surely been fashioned after its great exemplar. If we are to conceive of God under a form at all, it was natural for those early teachers, as well as for others, to apply the *human*, since it is not possible for man to imagine any one more exalted and noble than his own. The early Fathers indulged the pleasing fancy, that the soul of man served as a model for his body, even as the Divine Archetype served as a pattern for his soul, thus rendering them severally, as it were, first and second transcripts. The same general thought is found expressed in a Homily of *St. Clement*, with but few varying features. In a later period St. Methodius brings it out to the full, and zealously exclaims in opposition to Origen:

"What are we to think of such a fate, as to be robbed of our God-like form, and to come forth in the Resurrection without hands and feet!"

Tatian, towards the latter half of the second century, in his "Oration against the Greeks," which had been written prior to his fall and separation from the Church, remarks, that the image of God in man is to be found in his destination for immortality, which prerogative the Spirit of God imparts to the whole man, in and through his spiritual nature, as an organ, but which sin can neutralize, and render him accordingly mortal. Still, this deprivation is not to be considered as accomplished with such disaster as to preclude every possibility of a subsequent restoration of the same.

Nevertheless, neither Justin Martyr nor Tatian venture on any distinction between *image* and *likeness*, nor afford us any severally defined portions in the constitution of man, to which both the one and the other is to be separately applied.

Ireneus, however, approached the subject boldly, and draws a marked line between man's physical and spiritual natures, applying the "image" of God to the former, and the "likeness" of God to the latter. Writing against the Heretics, he tells us that our fleshly contour, or body, is fashioned after God as its archetype, and embodies in itself the Divine image, whilst our moral apartment, in which are lodged Reason and Will, by which we are enabled to discern and elect the good, constitutes the basis on which the Divine likeness is to be perfected. Ireneus then, first introduces us to the *distinction* which is to be observed between the image of God, on the one hand, and the likeness of God, on the other, which continues henceforth to hold its place through all subsequent periods of the Church, in a more or less prominent way, though not always under the same form. The Alexandrian Fathers and Teachers, more especially, take pains constantly to preserve it. It is to be regretted that Ireneus is charged with not remaining consistent with himself, in reference to his original defining of the likeness of God in man, since he speaks of it as having been lost in consequence of sin, and restored again in Christ, *i. e.*, Im-

mortality. The circumstance, even if taken for granted, does yet not interfere in the least with our present aim, as we are more concerned to establish the distinction itself, from the records of ecclesiastical history, than to maintain and defend the consistency of its advocates throughout all succeeding epochs.

Tertullian argues, that man is not fashioned after God, so far as it pertains to the lineaments of his body, since the Creator preserves for Himself an unvarying form (*secundum unifornem Deum*), but in reference to His substance solely, which resembles His character, and is endowed with freedom. Withal, in another passage he distinguishes between "image" and "likeness," almost in the same words with Ireneus. He believes man to be restored again to the likeness of God through Baptism, in the image of Whom he had been originally created. The image is to be sought for in his outward form, whilst the Divine likeness is made to consist in his capacity for Eternal Salvation. Thus, if we understand him aright, man is the image of God, as to his outward (*forma*), and the likeness of God, as to his development (*materia*).

If we now turn to the Alexandrian Teachers, we are afforded a full supply of lore, in reference to the "image" and "likeness" of God in man. A few of the most prominent specimens must suffice. As a class, they strive earnestly to avoid and combat every possible conception of the Deity that savors of the crude and carnal. They find it, accordingly, impossible to lodge any God-resemblance in man's bodily constitution. They seem to be possessed of a very tender and delicate instinct against the anthropomorphism of a later period. It were, at all events, not the only instance to be found in the History of the Christian Church, when the weapons to be used during some yet unborn age, had been found all ready formed and stored away in her armory, even as the stones by which Goliath was slain, had not been miraculously placed by the brook in the moment of need only. Thus this entire School may be said to have labored and taught prospectively in this regard.

Clement, of Alexandria, is very positive. "So far as the

image and likeness of God in man is concerned," he writes, "no allusion is had to the body of man. The mortal and the immortal have no affinity. What have mortality and immortality in common with each other? Much more is this Divine similitude to be sought for in man's Reason and Judgment, upon which element of his nature God has impressed His image, in order to the exercise of Charity and Dominion."

He is careful, notwithstanding, to distinguish between "image" and "likeness," subsequently. The "image" of God *in* man is by no means the same as his "likeness" *to* God. The former is already impressed in the process of birth, whilst the latter can only be said to be realized when perfection has been attained. The Divine Son of God is cited as embodying and realizing both "image" *and* "likeness" in Himself.

The ground for such a distinction is readily discerned. The spiritual nature of man warrants a comparison with the Deity in a two-fold relation, as it were. As an intellectual being, he stands already in a certain kinship with God, whilst he, still further, possesses the power of rendering his will in harmony with the Divine Will. In the New Testament the two points of comparison are plainly indicated. "And put on the new man, who, according to God, is created in justice, and holiness of truth." (Eph. iv. 24). "Lie not one to another, stripping yourselves of the old man with his deeds." (Col. iii. 9). "By it we bless God and the Father; and by it we curse men, who are made after the likeness of God." (James iii. 9). And as the double form—*εἰκῶν* and *ὁμοιωσις*—is preserved in the original record of his creation, it was felt that there existed a warrant to allot a peculiar signification to each term, in order to avoid an unbecoming tautology, as well as to invest them with a positive force. But since the fleshly body afforded but an unseemly lodgment for either, their next and natural refuge seemed to be, to draw a line of demarkation through his moral constitution, and to assign the several terms, "image" and "likeness," accordingly on opposite sides of the same line.

Clement advances still another thought in connection with this view, which we may not pass by unnoticed, as it may aid

us in making up our general *resumé*. The Logos is, according to his mind, the true and faithful "image" and "likeness" of God. The human soul is created after the Logos, and is, consequently, not a copy of the original, but a secondary edition.

Origen is of one mind, in the main, with Clement throughout, and maintains, that God's "image" and "likeness" must not be looked for in the body of man, since we cannot conceive of the Deity as compounded. With him too, the Divine Logos is the original "image" and "likeness" of God, of which the soul of man is a transcript or re-issue. He likewise distinguishes between the two terms—*image* and *likeness*—applying the former to the rational, and the latter to the dispositional elements in his moral nature. But not being sufficiently careful in employing the several terms uniformly, Epiphanius found room occasionally to charge him with teaching, that man had lost his God-resemblance in consequence of the Fall.

Novatian is satisfied by declaring the "image" and "likeness" of God in man to be found in his perceptive, and reasoning faculty.

Lactantius varies but little from Novatian. *Methodius*, at least according to Photius, is charged with advancing a number of theories on the subject in hand; but it is supposed that the latter but reflected his own mind, with a view of bringing the former under suspicion, and had Methodius felt inclined to reply, he might have adopted the words of his brother monk and chief assistant against the same adversary:—"You have thrown your darts into the midst of the crowd, yet pretend no one will be hurt. How great soever the eyes of your wisdom may be, they are blinded by the smoke of avarice and envy. Your passion against Ignatius deprived you of your sight."

It is not material to adduce any further authorities on the subject, from this period, as those already quoted do full justice to the general mind and view in regard to it. Enough is gathered for the purpose of demonstrating the anxiety felt in reference to the sense of our Biblical and historical terms—*image* and *likeness*.

As we advance in the history of the Church, the same

variety, and, sometimes, opposition of views obtains. The *Anthropomorphites*, both of the Syrian and Egyptian branches, place the Divine similitude in the body of man, and represent the Deity under a human form. The Church Fathers repel the idea with great warmth and unanimity, as blasphemous. But, like all great errors, it too, seems not entirely to lack some foundation. St. Augustine concedes, that in a certain sense, the God-resemblance may be conceived of as extending to the body of man as well, inasmuch as it exists as a living organism, and, by virtue of its perfect mechanism, is more akin to the Creator, than that of the animal indeed.

Epiphanius is not satisfied with any one or all of the theories expressed in regard to the controversy concerning God's image and likeness in man, and prefers rather to accept the plain declaration of Scripture, without defining the limits within which the Divine similitude shall be made to reside. He is especially averse to teaching, that the characteristic which distinguishes man from the animal, has been forfeited by the Fall.

Both *Gregory*, of Nyssa, and, of Nazianzen, together with *Hilary*, agree, in a general way, in lodging it in his Reason.

Athanasius, on the other hand, finds it in man's capacity to know God, and remarks, that he had been deprived of this Divine gift through the consequences of sin. He rests his theory on another view of his, which he advances in regard to a certain God-cognition, which had been impressed in the act and moment of his creation, but which has been eclipsed by the Fall. He too, with Hilary, repeats the view already detailed in reference to the Logos being the direct exemplar after which the human creature is formed. Gregory of Nyssa, still further attempts to prove, that the spirit of man is a picture of the entire Trinity.

Cyril, of Jerusalem, distinguishes between "image" and "likeness," recognizing the former in the soul endowed with freedom, and the latter in the inhaled grace of the Holy Ghost.

Chrysostom observes the same distinction, but refers the

image to the dominion of man over the kingdoms of creature life, according to Genesis i. 26; and teaches that the *likeness* of God in man is to be found in his ability and duty to perfect virtue as it is in God. He declares the dominion of man over lower creatures to have been vastly curtailed in consequence of the Fall, since the whole animal kingdom had previously been filled with a far greater degree of awe for their mundane head.

Isidore endorses this view, and sees in man's primitive dominion the symbol of his God-likeness.

Theodore, of Mopsuestia, discards every rendering which would lodge the "image" and "likeness" of God in man, either in his intellectual nature, or in his jurisdiction over lower life, but is more ready to discern it realized in the fact, that man is to form the connecting link between the visible and invisible worlds—a middle-being, bridging over the chasm, which would otherwise yawn between mortal and immortal forces.

Diodore, of Tarsus, falls back on man's kingly prerogative.

Theodoret extends the God-resemblance in man so far, as to cover therewith every similitude which may be discovered to exist in common between God and man—a view which we judge broad enough certainly, for all to stand upon, only that it leaves us all at sea, as much so as ever.

Cyril, of Alexandria, narrows his theory down in so far as to refer the God-likeness to man's Reason, together with his capacity for virtue and dominion.

Augustine, in his earlier writings, had taught that Adam lost the Divine similitude through the Fall, as something imprinted of God during the act and moment of his creation. In later life, however, he retracted this view, and maintains, that it indeed remained subsequent to the introduction of sin, but so seriously deformed as to need a renewal. He treats of the "image" and "likeness" of God in man repeatedly, and is inclined to recognize both, severally, in his spirituo-intellectual nature, and in his kingly jurisdiction.

Thus might we continue to catalogue the individual opinions

of the writers of the Church through all the different periods, but without discovering anything materially additional or new. The later we descend, the more of an inclination do we discern in the authorities to return to the views expressed by the minds of those whom we have named. Whatever novelty might be reported from the schoolmen, Abelard, Bonaventure, Aquinas and Dun Scotus and others, it would not, we fear, either edify or improve the head or heart of the reader, who may have sat down with us, and thus far surveyed the photograph, which we have endeavored to present from the material drawn from an anterior age. With this impression, we come to examine into the reigning views current, during and after the Reformation period.

Among the various Confessions we search in vain for a special dogma, defining the sense and compass of the several terms "image" and "likeness." The *Council of Trent* and the *Roman Catechism* but briefly discuss the doctrine of the Divine similitude in man. The expressions, *imago* and *similitudo* are taken as general terms, by which the original perfection of the Paradisaic pair is taught. In a general way the Catholic church understands and teaches the Divine "image" and "likeness" in man to signify his immortality, the freedom of his will and his *justitia originalis*.

The *Orthodoxos Omologia* of the Greek church sees it in the perfect innocency of man before the Fall, in which state he possessed a perfect wisdom, freedom of will and immortality. The *Greek Catechism* develops this principle somewhat more fully, according to the interpretation of the Patriarch Jeremiah, and places the Divine similitude in the perfect harmony of man's attributes and forces, in his aspirations after perfection—without, however, preserving a distinction between εἰκὼν and ὁμοίωσις.

The *Protestant* Confessions express themselves in general terms, according to one or another view already repeatedly advanced, whether we look to the Lutheran, Zuinglian, Calvinistic, Mennonite or Quaker persuasion. The variety of expression does not materially alter the sense. But as to any

distinction holding between the two characteristic terms, scarcely any mentioning of it is made. Calvin discards it entirely, and, of course, his followers think little beyond him. Zuingli and Luther speak of "image" and "likeness" as one word. The most marked recognition of any such distinction, is to be found in Bellarmine, who says:—*Imago ad naturam, similitudo ad virtutes pertinet; proinde Adam peccando non imaginem Dei, sed similitudinem perdidit.*

Later Theologians speak more fully on the Divine similitude in man, in treating of the Fall and its consequences. But it may well be doubted whether a single author can be pointed to, who utters anything nearer to our subject and aim than has been brought forward from the writers of former periods. We suspect Schleiermacher to have come quite near the truth when he declared: "It is not possible to define the primitive state of man within the compass of an exact dogma, and it is, consequently, just as impossible to teach with didactic force, in reference to his original perfection."

It is idle, therefore, to hope for light from Scott, Henry, Clark, Dick or any author of the more modern school, they, for the most part, being satisfied with simply retailing and expanding the material which their predecessors had gathered up and put into shape—and sometimes even, with doing worse.

From all that has been noted, it is perhaps possible to construct a general theory, which will embrace all the elements of truth, which are found to be contained in the teachings of the writers of the Church, during different ages, and which will serve to shed some additional light on what must ever remain a more or less dark theme.

The human nature embraces two constituent parts, as is evident from the Mosaic narrative—the Body and the Soul. The question may be raised, whether the body of man can in any way claim a resemblance with its Creator and framer? Every such idea is indeed scorned by late writers generally, and by a number of early commentators, as we have seen. "Descant ever so much, or ever so practically," says one, "upon man's upright and noble form, an upright form has no

more likeness to God than a prone or reptile one. God is incorporeal, and has no bodily shape to be the antitype of any thing material." This is strongly and bravely put, and seems to brand a few of the Fathers as very silly men, for entertaining a notion so foreign to truth. And yet when we come to think seriously of the *substance* of man incarnate, we are more inclined to believe man to be fashioned after Christ, than that Christ should have been formed after man. The grand aim in man's redemption, is to conform him "to the image of His Son." When the Scriptures present the Logos before us, as our antitype, we are inclined to view the *whole* Christ as such, and not a part of Him merely. "But we all, with open face, beholding, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image." Into whose image? Evidently Christ's, "who is the image of God"—yea, "the express image of His person." Nor can the saying of Saint Paul (Phil. ii. 6–7) be quoted as of force against this view, since Christ's assuming "the form and habit of a servant," or, "likeness of men," evidently implies in the connection, His subjecting Himself to the state and relations of *fallen* man. After He had passed through His period and process of humiliation, and was ready to sit down at the right hand of God, He still possessed, in outward contour, as well as in inward rectitude, all the elements and factors which constituted Him from the beginning and for all eternity the Divine Exemplar for man. It is man's *Logosity* which Ireneus has in mind, when he refers the "image" of God to his physical side. In any lower, or carnal view, he is as far from the anthropomorphism of a later age, as are the Alexandrian Fathers. Even Methodius can be pardoned, in this view, for imagining man to rise from the grave with "hands and feet," as he evidently sees him with a Resurrection body, akin to that in which the risen Saviour appeared to His joyful Disciples. This one feature distinguishes man from angels and other creatures of God, likewise created in His image, in more respects than one.

But, verily, let us not confine the Divine similitude in man to his body exclusively. All that we plead for is, that this

factor of his being shall not be entirely ignored. And having made proper account of it, the way is more open to lodge the God-resemblance in still other niches of his being.

Much is made of man's *royalty*, by virtue of which he is to exercise "dominion over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and the beasts, and the whole earth, and every creeping creature that moveth upon the earth." Such a limited dominion may, it is true, be regarded as an image of the absolute dominion which God exercises. But who cannot see that this is but an accident or consequence of an element, lying back and in man's nature? He was created in the image and likeness of God *in order* to hold such sway.

Besides, the angels and heavenly host may with propriety be thought of as being invested with still greater power, embracing even man as a subject, so that this feature, even if we admit it to be one of the exponents of a Divine similitude, would not constitute a prerogative *specially* applicable to man. And yet the Mosaic narrative represents man peculiarly formed, *because* created "in the image and likeness" of God.

The same may be said in regard to the view which would lodge the God-resemblance in man's *intellectuality;* in his *spirituality;* in his *immortality.* Without doubt, all these prerogatives combined, enter into our conception of a human being; but is it not at once apparent that they are not exclusive possessions of man, or peculiar to him alone? What is there to forbid us to believe that all the several orders of angels and spirits are endowed with the same lofty characteristics? If we would find the "image" and "likeness" of God in man, we hold, that it is obligatory upon us to fix on one essential quality *peculiar* to him alone. And this we can only detect in his resemblance to the Logos incarnate, who is represented as the express image of God. It is difficult for a worshiper, never so spiritually inclined, not to border on what may be termed a legitimate and orthodox anthropomorphism, in so far as to conceive of God, as personated in the Logos. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."

Taking it for granted that Clement and Origen and others entertained some such view of man's *Logosity* as constituting the *image* of God in his being, we see no difficulty in seeking for the *likeness* of God, in the perfection to be subsequently attained in a subjective way. Even if we admit a perfection in embryo, it is still further necessary that there should follow an actualization or realizing of the same in a consequent life and history. If the distinction which is universally made and admitted between *original* sin and *actual* sin, be not a mere distinction of the school, what is there in the way of admitting a similar distinction between an original and actual godliness—the *image* of God and the *likeness* of God in man? How does any more *scriptural* warrant appear in the one case than in the other? The fountain and its stream issuing of it, or the germ and the tree emerging from it, in the sphere of nature; the objective and subjective, or the abstract and concrete, in the parlance of the school, as well as original and actual sin, in Theology—these are but analogies to the relation which the Divine *image* and *similitude* in man sustain to each other. Or, if still further illustration is needed, it is afforded us in the relations which principle and history, or theory and practice bear to each other.

It is plain, from the position now taken, that the "image" is imprinted on every mortal, in the process of birth, as St. Clement maintains, or, in the act of creation, as is held by others. Whilst the "likeness" is as yet wanting, and may remain wanting entirely even, as the latter quality is something subsequent to the former, and involves a process of moral development, which depends on man's free will and personal co-operation. Only as both are made to merge or flow into each other, have we a complete picture of saintship, as it is in Jesus Christ, who is the perfect union of the Divine image *and* likeness—the Divine Proto-model.

This innate image constitutes the basis on which the acquired likeness may rest, in order to the perfecting of such a perfect saintly character; or, the organ of receptivity to the regenerating agency of the Holy Ghost, by whose working, in connec-

tion with man's co-operation, the likeness can alone issue from it as a product. It is by virtue of this image-organ in man, which is at one and common in both man and Christ, that he is still a redeemable creature, whilst the want of it renders the fallen angels irredeemable. The fallen angels have nothing in common with *our* Redeemer, and are consequently incapacitated to receive and appropriate His saving Grace in their own angelic personalities. To restore them to their forfeited estate, it were necessary for their proto-model, after whom they had been formed—if such there be?—to appear among them, subjecting Himself to their condemned condition, and to proffer them relief, who then, by virtue of the common nature extending to both parties, might embrace Him and gain deliverance. In the case of man, however, the circumstances are happily different. He, having been originally fashioned after the "image" of the Logos, who graciously assumed, besides, his fallen relations subsequently, at once recognizes his Deliverer, by virtue of the common image in both, and like Abraham of old, is glad. God did not arbitrarily construct a plan of redemption for man; but rather redeems him because he is *capable* of redemption through Jesus Christ, who stood to him in the relation of an "Elder Brother," already in the moment of his creation, in a certain sense, in consequence of the Divine image common to both. It is through their kinship prior to the Fall, that the plan of Redemption became so admirably feasible after the catastrophe of sin. Barring the Predestination factor, the Supralapsarian view is more congenial, than the Sublapsarian, which regards Redemption more as a remedy than as an original factor.

It is in view of this consideration too, that man can be elevated above the highest stage of angelic nature, on the one hand, or sink beneath the lowest grade of its condemnation on the other. Christ, by virtue of His Exaltation, has "led captivity captive," even to God's right hand. This is never predicated of angels and spirits in heaven. There is no provision or room left in their nature for such a glorification. It is only the living water that flows from out of the very throne of God itself that can thus seek and attain so high a level again.

It is only the creature created with God's image within him, and perfected in His very likeness again, through the regenerating grace of his homogeneous Redeemer, that can stand before the Lord God Omnipotent, without "veiling his face."

It is difficult, too, not to be haunted with the gloom of a still lower depth of depravity, in the case of a damned soul, than is occupied by the fallen angels. The strongest possible figures of woe are used in God's Word, by which the condition of condemned mortals is intended to be portrayed. Superficially read they seem indeed scarcely to be reconciled with the character of a God, the essence of whose being is Love itself, and to stagger sometimes even such as are of an honest faith. But when we come to recall the fact, that man carries within himself the "image" of God, which is capable of fruiting into His own glorious "likeness," and that both unitedly carry within themselves the possibility of constituting a character, meet for the company and association of the Triune God, in the highest heavens of felicity—when such a creature, with such a lofty destiny, should come short of his legitimate end, it is hard to imagine a pit bottomless enough for him to sink into. It is in consequence of his lofty nature, that he is dragged so far underwards, in case he enters on a decline. Tell us in whose image Lucifer had been created, and we may venture to assert, whether or not a fallen man can outmeasure him in his Fall. If the friends of God are to sit "on the right hand" of God, and His enemies be made His "footstool," will any one tell us how high an elevation, or how low a descent the several figures intend to indicate?

"The Resurrection of the Body" is a link in the chain which the Apostles' Creed forms. Stripping the article of every remnant of flesh and blood, which is unfitted for an entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven, we still are confronted by the idea of a Body, lying back and under all its carnal accidents, which the Incarnate Redeemer came to rescue, no less than the soul of man. The Divine Record teaches us that every seed produces a fruit after its kind. It is plainly for-

bidden, then, to believe in a Resurrection body, generically different from the human body, as originally created by God, after the "image and likeness" of the Divine Antitype. The corruptible, dishonorable, weak and natural elements transformed, into incorruptible, glorified, powerful and spiritual antitypes, does not convey to our mind so much an annihilation, as a sublimation into that body of the Son of God which had been set up for the entire man, in the morning of his formation and creation. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God"—bearing about us the original Divine *image*, quickened through the regenerating energy of the Holy Ghost; "and it doth not yet appear what we shall be"—when the Divine *likeness* shall have completely emerged; "but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him"—the embodied realization of both image *and* likeness; "for we shall see Him as He is." But He *is*, as He appeared in the mountain of Transfiguration, as He appeared unto Paul in ecstacy, or to St. John in Patmos—as He is beheld through the vision of Faith in the believer, who cannot conceive of Him otherwise than as the Protomartyr saw Him, in "the opened heavens, standing on the right hand of God."

A soul-inspiring little Legend echoes among the pages of different Commentators, in reference to the utterance of Malachi:—"*And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver.*" A saint is said to have inquired of a silversmith, "why and how long it was necessary to *sit* in order to refine and purify his metal?" The answer came in the words: "In order that, and until I am able to behold my own likeness in the molten mass." The practical lesson to be learned, is, that the believer is cast into the furnace of tribulation, and is suffered to remain in, until the inherent and hidden image becomes visible and outward in the likeness, when only he is prepared to constitute a personality like unto the Son of man.

ART. III.—PRIESTLY MEDIATION.

BY GEO. B. RUSSELL, A.M., PHILA.

CHRIST by His own divine authority constituted the office of the Christian ministry. This office, holding in a distinct order, is to be perpetuated in the Church to the end of time. It always represents His own whole three-fold office, continued ever present in His mystical body. Without it, there could be no real approach to Jesus, no right use of the saving means of grace, and hence, also, no sure salvation for our nineteenth century sinners. Saving faith comes to those who believe on Him "through them" whom He has commissioned to this ministry. So He prayed for them to the Father, who always heareth Him.

Preacher, Priest and Pastor, all belong to this sacred office of the holy ministry. To reveal the will of God, and proclaim His word of Gospel grace; to administer His Holy Sacraments, and to stand in Christ's stead now between God and the people in public worship; and to lead and govern the flock by rules of Divine law, constraining them by love in the obedience to the faith; these parts and powers are all included in the Christian commission of the holy ministry.

Jesus Christ did in fact, appoint men to such an office for His Church; did call fit men to fill it. Divine authority adequate to disciple the whole world was committed to the Apostles of Christ, because to Him first, for this very end, was given "all power in heaven and on earth."

He did not rob Himself of any of this power, when He sent such men, clothed with His authority, to act in His name. He breathed on them, and prayed for them to have in full, His now

delegated official power. Not only to the Apostles was this given, but to those in turn believing on Him through them, and those again, who should become "faithful men, able to teach others also." Our Lord's power was not only taken with Him to heaven; but was left in this regard with men, who were really authorized to exercise it here in His stead, in His body, the Church, to the end of time.

Divine authority for the Gospel ministry, in the main, is not generally disputed by Protestants. As a distinct order of official administration, the *Preaching Function* is strongly affirmed. But the *Priestly Power* is by no means as steadily maintained. And even the *Pastoral Office*, in the guiding and governing of the flock, is by very few, as clearly held.

Entirely too wide a range this whole subject presents, to be pursued in all its many-sided importance. And, since the Preacher, as an officer of the Christian Church, has been so frequently considered to the exclusion almost entirely of the Priest, we propose to direct some consideration to this particular administrative function of the holy office. Can we claim on true warrant Priestly Mediation in the Gospel ministry?

Our Lord Jesus Christ is, of course, the only High Priest of our profession. He is at once, in His person mysteriously uniting the human and the divine natures, the fullness of the Godhead and the completion of our humanity. All that was in the types and shadows of the old economy, bearing upon man's salvation, held primarily in Him. Priest and at-one-ment, mediation and offering, sacrifice and remission all looking forward from the Jewish stand-point centre in His coming, till His promises, in the fullness of time, are fulfilled in Himself. Prophet, Priest and King are all one in Him. Are they ever represented in any true sense in any others, in His stead?

When He came, as the Light of the world, giving men life in order to see the light, and finally leading captivity captive and dispensing gifts unto men, He did not destroy the old order of grace; but, in the highest sense, did only the more perfectly fulfil and honor it, in all its requirements. Truly, he made room for merging the appointments of Judaism into the higher,

freer, and more spiritual ordinances of Christianity. The old Jewish rites, Circumcision and the Passover, are now the Christian Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. So the old Worship of the temple service, is now the more spiritual service of the Christian Cultus. And the old office of the Priesthood is now raised in a real exaltation, to the Christian Ministry. Divine revelation passes from the Old Testament into the New Testament, only as more full, more comprehensive, and more gracious. Christianity is therefore more than Judaism; a *new creation*, from the bosom of the old.

Priests, in the Jewish economy, were an order of men divinely called and ordained to minister to the people in holy things. By the mere fact of their birth in the house of Levi, of the family of Aaron, they were "*called of God*, as was" the first High Priest to the sacred office. Providential circumstances in the order of grace, over which they had no control, fixed their personal relations to this holy office and its mystical duties; and to this, they were therefore, in due time, by special rites, solemnly set apart and ordained. Awfully solemn as was their official responsibility, it came upon them without any first choice or mere act of their own. Fitness, on their part, required that they should honestly and rightly use their heavenly powers, according to the will of God.

Their official acts were not made to have value in what they did as pious individuals, but in what God did by and through them. Offering sacrifice and prayers from the people to God; or administering circumcision, or judgment, or blessing from God to the people, the imperfect personal character of the officiating Priest did not invalidate any of his official acts. Profane and wicked Priests were responsible personally to God for their sin, but the value of the official acts was in no degree destroyed.

Mediating between God and the people, the office of the Priesthood represented the invisibly divine dealing with men, and at the same time a real contact of the human service with the invisible presence of the Lord God; whom the people came to worship. In the nature of the case, no man can take this office upon himself by mere personal choice; and no man is so holy

that on account of his piety merely he can assume, fitly, its tremendous functions. Not in any such subjective conditions does the value or efficiency of this office consist. But when any man is called as was Aaron, the official mediation between the human and divine is real.

Its whole force, meaning, and value comes from the divine side. By virtue of the call and ordination from God, in the appointment and commission, the supernatural powers brought to bear in a human personality, are properly official. These powers from one's acting thus in God's name and stead, the Apostle Paul compares to a treasure put in earthen vessels, so as to reveal the divine profiting, rather than any human excellence. And yet, it is an office, distinct and apart from the general priesthood and calling of believers.

So, in the Christian Church. Christ chose out of the whole number of His disciples, twelve to be Apostles. He did commit official duties unto them, answerable to His own three-fold office of Prophet, Priest, and King; all of which is to be perpetually in the Church. Priestly power is as much a reality, therefore, in the Christian Ministry as any other part of the sacred office. There is a special function in this office, by the divine commission lodged in the acting official, by the force of an objective authority and efficiency, bearing divine seals.

All, now as ever, centres nevertheless in the Person of the God-man, who ever liveth Head over all things to the Church; whose ordinances shall never fail, because He is the same yesterday, to-day and forever. The *whole* official character of the Christian Ministry is continued from the Person of Christ, through the Apostles onward to the present time. It has always been able to authenticate its heavenly commission in the promise that, for its own ends, our Lord will be always with His appointed prophets, priests and kings. No part of the office has since been abrogated by the authority that constituted it. Clothed with a real conferred power, the ministry go forth in the name of our exalted Lord; and neither at any time have the gates of hell prevailed to destroy any part of the ministerial office. The continuance of the Church, by the faithful preach-

ing of the Word, (Prophet) requires also the right administration of the Sacraments (Priest); and the proper ruling of believers, (King).

Yet in our day there are those who deny, that Christ has made and continued any special order, or ministerial office, in the Christian Church. The minister, they affirm, is nothing more than any other good man. His divine call and ordination by the appointment of Christ in the authorities of the Church, where the Holy Ghost's administrative power forever abides, all go for nothing. He is not more after He receives this authority, than He was before the sacred transaction. And even to claim for this, any divine authority and functional power, by the Holy Ghost thus operative, for ministerial acts by virtue of ordination, is popish. True freedom in this bald sense, conceives it necessary to deny all priestly ministerial acts. To escape priest-craft, the reigning popular mind disrobes the minister, and places him on a level with other people—unless his individual piety outranks his fellow Christians. His official acts, in the name of Jesus, they refuse to acknowledge as bearing the seal of invisible divine sanction, in any real supernatural way.

All this in the mouth of the profane infidel world, would not be so surprising. For the kingdom of the devil is always in hostility to the presence of the reign of grace, and will not hesitate to gainsay and blaspheme it. Whatever is in sympathy with them is plainly opposed to the kingdom of God. The world, the flesh and the devil are antagonistic to the reign of Christ; and therefore the offence of the Cross has not yet ceased.

Rationalism shows its affinity, right here, for anti-Christ in its sympathy with what is in hostility to the whole reigning order of grace in the Church. The supernatural, now at hand in the kingdom of heaven, challenges and rebukes carnal unbelief. And this last, to relieve itself denies the very existence of any higher present supernatural power.

Hence, the rationalistic class of thinking, now so common in some parts of modern Protestantism, rejects those supernatural

claims which a real Gospel ministry, if true to its heavenly calling and commission, must steadily put forth. A wrong conception of the objective grace of the gospel, may lead men far into erroneous and vicious thinking. It is certainly no more safe, to be found holding common grounds with rationalists and infidels, than to be found in some such points in company here with high-church men of Romanizing tendency.

Others admitting the existence of a sacred office of the *Christian* ministry, claim for it only *Preaching Power*. But it is difficult to admit this function, as a continuance of Christ's office, without logically also being required to provide for the *Priestly part*, as well. With the consideration of this, be it remembered, we are just now more directly concerned.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper as we have already seen, take the place in the new revelation of Circumcision and the Passover in the old. The mystical character of the old rites passed over into the New Testament Sacraments. So, Christian Worship now also takes the place of Mosaic ceremonial service; and yet, in its truly spiritual character, it unites the visible and the invisible in a most real way. So does the Priestly in the Christian Ministry hold the same analogous relation to the supernatural, that the old priesthood did, in its officiating place between God and the people. There must be a real visible, as well as invisible, mediation.

The fact that Christ has come to be the only Mediator between God and man, as the great High Priest of the New Testament, after the order of Melchisedec, does not take any sacredness or real official power from the holy office of those, whom He has ordained in His Church to represent Him. Because He ever lives and reigns our Prophet, Priest and King, those, with His commissioned authority and power, are sent to represent Him in all these among men. "As my Father hath sent Me, so send I you." "He that heareth you, heareth Me." Because all power in heaven and on earth is in His hands, therefore are there those authorized by Himself to exercise these gifts in His name.

Let us then consider more carefully, whether there is now PRIESTLY POWER in the Gospel Ministry.

Some will have it, that there is no offering upon the altar of the Gospel, in fact in no sense is there an altar at all in the Church, and therefore no need of one to make that office real. When you remind them that they are called upon to offer themselves as a living sacrifice unto God, which is a most reasonable service; they claim, that this is such a spiritual offering, that each one in the general priesthood of believers must make that personally. So for the offering of general Worship to God, they also assert the necessity of each one doing this for himself. There must be according to this theory no mediator between them and God. Immediately, all grace is to be received and all offerings to be made. Each one is to transact all spiritual matters between Christ and himself directly, with no one else standing in the way. It derogates in this same view from the Mediatorial office of Christ, and interferes with His High Priestly functions, to have any man represent these in His name here in the Church. And besides, it is liable to the worst kind of abuse.

To admit this false view, is to subvert the reality of the Church itself. As no one can understand the Truth of grace and salvation, "except some man teach" him; so, no one can offer himself to God and be received formally into His kingdom of grace without submitting to God's own appointed way. All truly pious Worship, whether of personal surrendery, or of praise and thanksgiving, culminates in the Sacraments, as in Baptism and the Lord's Supper. But as no man can in the first instance, administer these unto himself; neither can he immediately worship God aright, till assured of reconciliation with Him. A man in contempt of court has no status there, till purged of that contempt by the office of some one acting for him. And the pardon of a criminal does not come to him with full effect, until officially announced by some one authorized by the executive. The priestly office in the ministry holds an analogous place in the Church. By this the Sacraments are

administered and sacrificial offerings of praise and thanksgiving are accepted of God.

Nor does this in any sense detract from Christ, as our only High Priest and Mediator. No person, even of very evangelical proclivities, would consider that the prophetical office of the Preacher, in the Gospel Ministry, whose duty it is unquestionably to *teach* the nations in Christ's name and stead; no one, we say, thinks this interferes with the official dignity of Christ, the great Prophet. And He also committed the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven "to His Apostles," without taking from Himself His regal glory, which He will in no wise give to another. Now, if this is possible and real, why may it not be *as possible and as real*, to delegate His priestly office of mediation and administration to men divinely ordained in the Gospel Ministry,—without detriment to His cause in the world, or loss of His dignity and glory in heaven? He loses nothing, by allowing men, in His name and enlightened by the Holy Ghost, to instruct the world in heavenly wisdom. Neither does He forfeit His High Priestly and Mediatorial glory, by sending men under the same Spirit, to carry forward His work among men, in officially administering the means of grace.

Men are no more likely to abuse the one trust, than they are to misuse the other. In both, they have power to act, only in accordance with His will. There is nothing in their office, to allow them to act by mere whim for themselves—as they please. Not in their own name, nor in their own strength; but in the Lord's name, with His authority and power, the minister of the Gospel goes forth in all his official acts.

"He gave some, Apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Therefore are they called, appointed and sent, to be the messengers of the Lord of hosts, His ambassadors, and His priests, whose lips should keep knowledge. So, His ministers, by virtue of what is in them as Christ's anointed, become the light of the world, the salt of the earth, and where

two or three are gathered together in His name, there is assurance of His presence.

Official functions of whatever character among men imply mediation and intervening authority. The universal priesthood of believers does not prevent a special order in office, by divine call and ordination from God, in the Church. No more does universal citizenship stand in the way of there being special officers of the Government called and set apart to intervene and mediate between us and the civil power. By virtue of their office, they represent the government; and its authority reaches us only through their mediation. We can only thus know the government and get at it, in its official representatives. By these, its power and authority touch us. In short, we cannot find the government, with all its irresistible power to punish and protect, except as we have it mediated to us by the intervention of properly chosen and commissioned officials.

God's kingdom is just as real for our life; and it is mediated and authenticated to us, in a similar way. The unseen and eternal is revealed to us in Jesus Christ. But we cannot know Him, except as He makes Himself known to us, in His Word and Sacraments, by the Holy Ghost. He sends men therefore to declare His Word and, mediately to administer to us His Sacraments. We, in fact, never get these means, by which we learn to know and love Him, without the office of these men who are authorized and sent of God, to minister these unto us. These acts all hold in God through man, not by man of himself. No one however great his personal piety, who is not called as was Aaron, can take any ministerial function, priestly or pastoral, upon himself. Power to appoint and invest them, can only be by divine call and commission; and when so clothed, they are to us officially in Christ's stead, between God and man.

Real presence of the kingdom of heaven, with real Sacraments, conveying real grace, requires a real mediation of these to men. As they are also visible as well as real, the mediating official in their administration must be no less visible. Any thing less than this is of Gnostic tendency, or Quaker abstraction.

So, a real king does not always, not even generally, execute his own orders in person. And what he does by an ambassador is really done by himself, without detracting in any degree from his royalty, or power, or dignity. In Christ's kingdom, we may expect to find such analogies or likenesses. Our Saviour Himself says: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a kingdom," a king with servants to do his will; and He is now no longer Himself a servant, but appoints others in His stead.

Accordingly, we find this, in fact, in the practice of Jesus, while on earth in the flesh. When He fed the multitude He distributed the miraculous gifts of food and blessing to the people, by the mediating service of His disciples. To them He first gave, and the hungry people received it from their hands. The power and glory of the miraculous supply of the feeding was nevertheless Christ's, though He mediated this to the multitude in its administration. In the same manner also after His Ascension to the right hand of the Father; though He called Paul by His miraculous appearing, yet He sent Ananias to mediate the washing away of his sin, by administering Baptism to this end. So, too, the Holy Ghost directed the official authority of the Church at Antioch, to set apart Paul and Barnabas to the Gentile missionary work; and this was mediated to them by the laying on of hands and prayer. This was in full force in the early Church.

Thus, it appears that mediations, in administrative official functions, were continued, from the old, over into the operations of the new covenant. The divine factor of authority and power has never been sundered in the Church, from the living human official in the name and stead of Christ. We claim this as a genuine part of the truth once delivered to the saints. And it is not Romanizing to hold this priestly mediation in the Gospel ministry. In the early Church, before Romanism, there were Christian priests.

"It was one act of the priest's office to offer up the sacrifice of the people's prayers, praises and thanksgivings to God, as their mouth and orator, and to make intercession to God for them. Another part of the office was in God's name to bless

the people, particularly by admitting them to the benefit and privilege of remission of sins by spiritual regeneration or baptism. Above this was the power of offering up to God the people's sacrifices at the altar; * * * the sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving in commemoration of Christ's bloody sacrifice upon the cross, mystically represented in the creatures of bread and wine; which whole sacred action was commonly called the Christian's reasonable and unbloody sacrifice, or the sacrifice of the altar."—*Bingham*, I. p. 204.

As we learn of God by His word of truth in the mouth of His sent servants, and obey Him in the administration of His means of grace, through the authorized servants of the Lord; so we approach Him and receive the seals of His blessings at the hands of His servants delegated to mediate in His stead. This was part also of the office of the Old Testament priests. They represented the divine before the people, standing between them and the Lord Jehovah. They offered the people's prayers, praises, thanksgiving, petitions, intercessions *and* sacrifices. Only the bloody sacrifice has been abolished. The priest standing between the people and their judgments and blessings, they learned "the law at his mouth," for he was "the messenger of the Lord of hosts." The people had no higher appeal, or more direct and immediate approach in their own individual or collected wisdom, to the Lord.

Never were they to watch the priests and feel sure they could detect a purpose in their spiritual leaders to mislead them. The people were never exhorted to assume themselves purer and more spiritual than those placed *over* them, in the Lord. The most spiritual of all governments never raised the people, independently of all priestly intervention, directly to God. All spiritual acts were mediated by divinely ordained men.

Jesus did not, in the Gospel, revolutionize this relation. He charged His disciples to observe all the duties required of them, by those who sat in Moses' seat. He Himself did not, on fit occasions, set aside their office and its divine mediations, as when the healed leper was to show himself to the priests;

though He did, as their Master, rebuke their dreadful hypocrisy. In fact He could not dishonor Himself; therefore He would have His accredited servants honored, even if they personally were undeserving.

In the new revelation of His grace, the old having been fulfilled by exact obedience, the sacred office still holds first in His own divine-human Person. And, in the out-flow from His personal fullness, He honors Himself in the continued transmission of His priestly, as well as prophetical and kingly office from age to age. Those who, in His stead acting, "lord it over God's heritage," are not *usurpers of official trust;* but the charge against them is that they *abuse that which* has been really given them to rightly administer. Hence Paul admonishes the people, to esteem them very highly, who minister to them in Christ's name. Ordained by the Church, at the instance of the Holy Ghost, the people might, without risk or danger, love and trust them.

Christian ministers, in all their offices, have been much abused. Appeals to popular will and carnal prejudice have done much to degrade the whole office. The ministry, as *preachers*, ought to be heard as the oracles of God. If there has not been an utter mistake in their calling and ordination, they are able, by divine help, to teach the wisest people in the way of life, with more success, than mere unordained men. If they be regarded as *pastors*, by which name they are often distinguished in the New Testament, they are to be considered fit to lead the flock; not to be led, or driven, by the people—who ought to follow them into the green pastures and by the still waters, which the Holy Comforter provides. Or, as *bishops*, they watch for souls. The unfaithful watchman incurs a most fearful responsibility; but the Lord will hold him to account—not those who have not been faithfully warned.

Feeding the sheep and lambs requires the shepherd to manage and govern the flock, for which the Lord provides supplies. Abusing this trust, is again proof that the office has a real trust committed to it. But because of a possible danger here is no sufficient reason, why the flock should be taught

that there is no such office; or if there is, that they should, as a rule, refuse to be led, presuming all the while that they will be misled, if they follow at all; and that they can enjoy the best pasture by finding it and seizing it for themselves.

People owe obedience to Christ in His ministry. They are to receive His blessings in His divinely appointed means of grace, which are mediated to them in signs and seals administered by the Gospel Priest-hood. Thus the operations of the Holy Ghost are to be made truly available. In this way, His voice is to be heard, in all humility and godly fear, in hearty repentance and obedient faith. Until Christ by a new revelation, authenticated by divine miracles, makes every one, as to this, a law unto himself as his own priest, he is bound to hear the teaching of the Church. What seems good to the Holy Ghost and the assembled Church authorities must be law for those who own and submit to the ministrations of Christ; not brought to us by angels or nature's agents, but by men, in the power of the Holy Ghost.

Just as in this way Christ has sent men to preach His Gospel, so does He also anoint them with the Holy Ghost to mediate His saving grace. There is no such danger, that the priestly will be more duly exalted than the prophetical, as to justify its total denial. Few people are really liable to be priest-ridden, except those who are warned by some ecclesiastical demagogue, in order that, taking advantage of their alarmed fears, he may use their aroused prejudices for his own sinister advantage. When irreverence and gross disregard for God's real presence, in holy things and sacred offices, is so general in the public mind, it is easy, cheap and popular, to raise a suspicious cry against those who rebuke this sin.

Worse than arrant folly is it, however, to thus invalidate the sacred authority of any part of the official trust of the holy ministry. One of the most grievous sins, for which God's people were made to suffer sore judgments, was their frequent unwillingness to hear His divine voice and accept His presence in the person of His ministering servants. History does not reveal a single case of God's blessing, where the people attempt

to set aside His ministry, and rush into His immediate presence. No reforms, even of acknowledged abuses, come in that way. The Reformation, in the Sixteenth century, was not a work of the people, as over against the Roman Catholic priesthood. It is a notorious fact, that the leading Reformers were themselves all ordained men, in the holy office, trained by the Holy Ghost in the old Catholic Church, for the sacred work God appointed unto them.

Gross impiety is it, therefore, to refuse Christ's divine mediation and priestly intervention reaching the people through authorized servants. It is a profane denial of His wisdom, in thus constituting His offices ever present in the Church. It is proud rebellion against His power, thus really challenging men, touching them, receiving on His behalf their formal submission, and bestowing in return the real benefits of grace.

It is not infallible, nor free from possible abuse; because it is an office held by imperfect men, liable individually to error and sin. Awfully solemn is the responsibility of this Christian Priest-hood. But so is any heavenly commission. That, to preach the Gospel and teach God's truth, is an official trust not always kept in perfect faithfulness. Priestly abuse of power is no greater sin, nor more common, than the shortcomings of Christ's Prophets. It is as awfully possible, and as likely found actual, that the preacher fail to preach Christ and Him crucified, as that the priesthood of the Gospel ministry fail to act in Christ's stead and in His name, and by His power alone.

Waiving all further excursion of treatment, we conclude as to this subject:

1. That, as all power in heaven and on earth is in the hands of our blessed Lord, He has it to dispense to His servants, whom He sees fit to clothe with any part of it, to act in His name.

2. That, although all Christians partake, according to our Catechism, of His three-fold anointing, yet, He has commissioned and ordained special officers, to represent Him more

fully than the whole people can, in His three-fold office of Prophet, Priest and King.

3. That, therefore, the *whole* of Christ's office is continued in His ambassadors in the Church; and hence, the Priestly element is now yet in the Gospel ministry.

4. That, in the New Testament there were really such acts of intervention and Priestly Mediation sanctioned and owned by the Holy Ghost; and that this self-same Spirit has, in the whole subsequent History of the Church, authenticated the official intervening mediation, in priestly acts, of those who minister to us in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

ART. IV.—THE RELATION OF THE PRESENT TO THE PAST AND TO THE FUTURE.

BY REV. J. M. TITZEL, A. M., EMMITTSBURG, MD.

WE propose, in the present article, to offer some thoughts on the relation which the present sustains to the past and to the future.

Do the events of time, like the erratic phantoms of a dream, follow one another without reason or order? or do they steadily and resistlessly move onward in strict accordance with established laws? Do they succeed one another in a mere mechanical way, or are they, as it were, organically bound together? and if so, what is the nature of their progression or development? These are some of the questions which shall claim our attention, and which we shall endeavor, at least, in part to answer, in the discussion of the subject now before us.

That the things which have been and those which are, and that the things which are and those which shall be, are in some respects intimately connected and dependent, is universally felt and acknowledged. Such connection is indeed a fact of such common observation, that it is impossible to ignore it. All men well know from their own experience that their present

is at least in many particulars the result of their past; and so, too, they know no less surely that their future will, in some measure, depend on their present. This much even the rude savage never fails to learn.

Few persons, however, are able fully to realize the fact that this connection is universal. That all things in the present have been affected and conditioned by the past, and that all things that shall be in the future will be affected and conditioned in turn by the present, is not generally recognized and felt to be the case. Most men are continually wont to think that it is otherwise—prone to imagine that they will be able, in many cases, to reap something altogether different from what they are now sowing, and to believe that there are many things which they may do which will in nowise affect their final destiny, but, on the contrary, will pass away and leave no trace behind. They have no doubt at all that many things pertaining to the present will tell on the future, but they can hardly conceive that everything that now exists and is going on will do so. That the victories of Alexander, of Cæsar, and of Napoleon, made a deep impression on contemporary affairs, and changed the course of history for all succeeding time, they readily admit, but they would consider as fanciful the assertion that the quarrels of lovers and the disputes of husbands and wives have also determined, in some measure, the character of the ages.

Yet it can be scientifically proved that there is nothing in the universe so small and insignificant as to be devoid of all value and importance in the sum of created things. On the contrary, it can positively be demonstrated that even the smallest atom of matter, or the most trifling product of man's intellectual and moral being, has its part to perform, and conditions in some measure the whole course of the world's subsequent history. What the earth now is, and what in the future it will be, it is and will be only because of the sum total of the things and powers which constitute it. If one grain of sand more had been originally created than there was, the earth would not now, nor yet in coming time, be just what it

is, and what it will be. For no power on earth, or belonging inherently to the earth, could ever have destroyed that additional grain, and yet existing it must have necessarily increased, to some degree, the attraction of the earth, and so affected the movements of the whole planetary system. Any change in these movements, however, would also have necessarily affected everything pertaining to the earth. Again, had the arrangement or the composition of the different atoms which compose the surface of the globe, at the beginning, been otherwise than it was, it would have led to a corresponding change in regard to everything else. The change might, indeed, have been, perhaps, imperceptible, but it would not on this account have been any the less real.

Now, what is true of the atoms of matter which compose the earth, is equally true of all the forces pertaining to the world, whether physical, intellectual or moral. Any change in any one of these, it could be readily proved, must produce a corresponding change in all the others. And this is so, not only as regards things and powers in space, but also as regards the same in time. Had a single thought in the past, accordingly, been different from what it was, no matter how trifling it might have been, it must have produced a corresponding difference in the thoughts of the present, and, consequently, also, in the thoughts of the future. A difference of thought, however, must likewise have expressed itself finally in a difference of action. Thus it can easily be perceived how a change in one sphere must lead to changes in all the spheres of existence.

But science does not only teach us that everything, however trifling it may appear, is really of value and importance in the sum of created things, but, also, that law universally prevails. Nothing takes place at random. There is no such thing as chance. Everywhere scientific observation discovers invariable connections of coëxistence and sequence among phenomena. The common experience of every-day life teaches us that night and day succeed each other continually in regular order, and that the varied seasons of the year, with singing birds and ripened harvests, with gathered fruit and chilling winds, un-

failingly come round at their appointed time. Astronomy makes known to us that among the stars also law exerts supreme sway, and that the planets, which like golden lamps are set in the sky, hold their place in the heavens, and pursue their course around the sun in harmonious concert preördained. Botany and Zoology show us that order and system prevail throughout the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and that in both growth and development proceed in accordance with fixed and invariable laws. Natural philosophy proves that even thunder and lightning, those fearful agents of the skies, are subject to the control, and may be made to do the bidding of man; while Geology informs us that law reigns through all knowable ages, and shows that the very same agencies have been at work from the remotest time. Moreover, statistics of marriages and of crimes reveal the startling fact that not even the actions of men are beyond the all-controlling influence of pre-determined law. Thus we perceive that law is predominant everywhere and at all times, and that there is nothing in the created universe which is not subject to its government.

Moreover, the discoveries and observations of science teach us that the relation which holds between the various forces and orders of existence and the succeeding events of time, is not merely mechanical, but organic. The whole creation is, as it were, but one grand and mighty organism, which in the onward flow of the ages is more and more unfolding itself, and, in predetermined solemn march, amid conflict and strife, is steadily moving onward towards its proper consummation. This, we think, is evident from the fact that everything is, as we have already observed, bound together in the closest connections and relationships; and still more from the further fact that the order of development which manifests itself in the growth of plants and animals may likewise be traced in the progression and unfolding of the events of history. We are confirmed in this conviction also by the testimony of Scripture, which clearly represents the entire creation as an organic whole. For we are not only taught in the book of Genesis

that the earth was cursed because of man's transgression, so that it might truthfully be said that when man fell,

> "Earth felt the wound; and Nature from her seat
> Sighing through all her works gave signs of wo;"

but it is expressly declared in the Epistle to the Romans, "that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." That the language of the apostle cannot justly in this case be resolved into anything like a mere rhetorical flourish, the whole connection of the passage in which it occurs, as well as the general tenor of scripture, abundantly proves. Thus Science and Revelation alike, as will ever be the case when both are properly understood, testify that the events of time are not related to each other, and do not follow each other, in the same way as the erratic phantoms of a dream. Both teach us that the products of time are most closely bound together, and, as it were, vitally connected.

From what has now been said, we learn that the relation of the present to the past is a most intimate one. The present is indeed, in a deep and true sense, the offspring of the past. What it is, it is only because of what the past was. Had preceding ages been different, the present would also be different. The solid earth on which we tread, the starry heavens above us, which in beauty look down upon us at night and watch our silent slumbers, the social and political organizations under which we live, the religious blessings which we enjoy, as well as the physical, mental and moral characteristics which pertain to us and distinguish us, are all what they are just because of what has preceded us. Had it not been for the discovery made by Columbus, and the oppression endured by our forefathers in the Old World, it is not probable, if we should be at all, that our physical appearance and mental and moral character would be what they are, or that we should live under the form of government of which we are now so justly proud. So, had it not been for the philosophical speculations of Plato, of Aristotle, and of the Schoolmen, and for the profound discussions and earnest defence of the faith engaged in by the fathers

of the first centuries of the Christian era, and for the reformatory movements of the Sixteenth century, we should not have the philosophical systems of the present, nor the theology of modern Germany and of Mercersburg, nor even the general religious knowledge which we now possess. In the present the past still lives, and moves, and has its being.

In the same way will what now is live in what will come after it. For in the same sense in which the present is the offspring of the past, will the future be the offspring of the present. What is now doing will permanently condition the character of what will be done when what is will have become what was. The studies in which we are engaged, the plans for private and public enterprises which we are devising, the institutions which we are establishing and endowing, the views which we are promulgating, together with all the thoughts which are occupying our minds, have to do not only with our own happiness and well-being, but also with the happiness and well-being of millions yet unborn. "No man liveth unto himself and no man dieth unto himself." There is something startling in the thought, but it is nevertheless true, and, therefore, highly desirable that all should be deeply impressed with it.

But though the present is the offspring of the past, the result of its various tendencies and workings, yet it is in no sense the mere reproduction of the past. A tree, or an animal, in the process of growth and development, greatly changes its character. Sometimes indeed it is difficult to realize that what we now see before us is the same plant, or animal, as the case may be, on which we used to gaze in years gone-by. Now it is so to a great extent with regard to all things by which we are surrounded, and which come within the sphere of our experience and activity. We ourselves are not just what we were some years ago. We have changed physically and mentally. Our outward appearance is in more than one respect different from what it was, and the views which we now entertain are by no means those which we entertained, when in early youth we built our airy castles, and with eagerness sketched in fancy

the picture of ourself in coming years. The present reality contrasts strangely with what was imagined in the dreams of youth. *Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis.* But as it is with us, so is it with all mundane things. The physical aspect of men generally is, in more than one particular, different from what it was in centuries that have passed away. Of this we have a striking illustration in the descendants of the Irish and German in this country, who in many cases scarcely retain any longer any resemblance at all to their ancestors. The social, political and religious life of the present is also different from that of the past. The customs of society have undergone great changes, and much which was once considered unobjectionable in manner would not now be tolerated. The Monarchies of Europe to-day are not what they were six centuries ago, nor is the Republic of the United States what the Republic of Athens was. The Church of the present, too, whether we consider the Greek, Roman or Protestant branch of it, as regards both the apprehension of doctrine and the form of government, is not what it once was. Neither Protestantism nor Roman Catholicism stands just where it did in the Sixteenth century. Changes have taken place in both as they have in everything else.

But as the present differs from the past, so also will the future differ from the present. The coming ages will no more be a mere reproduction of the present than the present is of the past. Changes have not only taken place in the material substances which compose the earth; in the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms, and in the social, political, and religious organizations of mankind, but will continue to take place until the final consummation of all things will be reached. Though it is frequently very positively asserted that history repeats itself, yet this is not strictly correct. History never repeats itself. The earlier events of time, it is true, prefigure the later, just as the first leaves of a plant are a type of what the last will be, but there is no more repetition in the former case than there is in the latter. The life of the world, so to speak, remains, indeed, ever the same, but the forms in which it manifests itself

are continually changing. The future, therefore, must necessarily be different from the present. In coming years not just the same phases of life will present themselves for consideration which now claim our attention, and the vital questions of to-day will not be likely to be those of the distant morrow.

But here the inquiry arises, How does the present differ from the past? and what will be the nature of the changes which we may expect in the future? A careful comparison of the past with the present alone can enable us to give a proper answer to this inquiry. Now such comparison, we think, will disclose to us the fact that there are at least three respects in which the latter as a rule differs from the former. There may be said to be generally if indeed not always, more diversity, more definiteness, and more unity manifested in the present than there was in the past. This is scientifically proved to be the case in vegetable and animal organisms. In their development there is always a change going on through continuous differentiations and integrations from the more simple to the more complex, and from the less definite and coherent to the more definite and united. And we all know this to be the case as regards our own life. Our thoughts, views, and mental acquirements are at present far more varied than they were years ago. So they are also more distinct and coherent. Many of our ideas and opinions which formerly were very vague, are now clear and definite; and many things which we then associated together in a mere mechanical way we now recognize as necessary parts of a systematic whole. But what science has proved to be true of the development of vegetable and animal life, and we know from experience to be true of our own development, there is abundant reason to believe is equally true of the development of all the products of time—of all the evolutions of history.

The present throughout shows more varied forms of life and of thought than the past. Increased diversity is indeed everywhere discoverable. Even the earth itself, which we are inclined to look upon as fixed and permanent, as to its outward form, Geology teaches us is far more heterogeneous now than it

once was. When as a fluid mass in ages long gone by it revolved around the sun, it could not possibly have presented the diversity of appearance that it now does, with its mountain heights and ocean depths, its hills and valleys, its lakes and rivers, its shady groves and flowery meadows, its desert wastes and cultivated plains, its dense forests and many-peopled cities, together with its almost endless variety of vegetable and animal life which is continually becoming more and more complex. Man himself, also, strikingly shows the tendency there exists and manifests itself in the onward flow of the ages towards heterogeneity. Once there was but one family among the members of which there must have been a marked similarity, but now we distinguish no less than five distinct races with an ever-increasing diversity of form and feature. Turning from man to his social, political, and religious organizations, we shall find still more conclusive proof of the fact which we are considering. All these, as any one may readily convince himself by an examination of them, are more complex and varied now than they were centuries ago, or even until within quite recent times. So too is there increased diversity in men's speech. Once all men spoke in one tongue, but now we have no less than eighty different languages and more than three thousand different dialects. The vocabularies of these different languages are also steadily increasing, and never were our dictionaries so bulky as they are now. In the arts and sciences the same increased variety, it is scarcely necessary to say, is likewise observable. The number and importance of its scientific discoveries is, indeed, one of the most marked features of the present age. The most striking evidence, however, in favor of the truth of what we are maintaining is, perhaps, furnished in the increased facilities of communication which we possess. First men could make known their thoughts, wishes and doings to one another only by speech. But in the onward course of time writing was invented, and then printing came to their assistance. Next steam increased their power of imparting information, and now we have, in addition to all these modes of communication, the Electric telegraph, by means of which news are almost instan-

taneously conveyed from continent to continent, and we are thus enabled to know what is going on in the old world earlier in the day than it there occurs!

But there is also more definiteness in the present than there was in the past. The outer form of the earth is not only more diversified than it was when a fluid mass, but also more distinct. The races of men are now more definitely marked than they once could have been. The social relations between man and man are also more clearly established and fixed. The individual, moreover, has become a more definite and prominent factor in government than he was in ages past, and his separate existence and rights are, consequently, more fully recognized by those in authority. The language of men is likewise not only more diversified than it once was—does not merely afford greater variety of expression, but also conveys far greater definiteness of meaning. The lines which separate the different sciences are daily being more fully determined and deeply drawn, and the knowledge which they impart is far more clear, distinct, and satisfactory than it was even a few decades ago. In Theology, too, there is decided advancement in this direction. Many doctrines which were once vague have been clearly defined and established, and the form of others is now coming to be settled and fixed. The doctrine of the Trinity, of the Person of Christ, of man's depravity, and of Justification, for instance, are all more fully developed, and more distinctly apprehended, than they were in the first centuries after Christ: and the doctrine of the Church which of late years has been so earnestly discussed is also beginning to be more and more clearly understood.

In addition to the increased diversity and definiteness of the present, there is also an increased unity. This statement at first thought may seem to involve a contradiction. It might at least appear to some as if diversity were incompatible with unity. Such however is not really the case. There is less diversity in a stone than in a tree, yet there is far greater unity between the different parts of the latter than between those of the former. The greatest diversity indeed may, and even does exist along with the deepest and most real unity. This is strik-

ingly manifest in the higher forms of organic life. But diversity is not only compatible with unity, but the unity may be said to increase with the diversity. That the surface of the earth, though more varied, is yet more coherent now, than when it was a molten mass, no one who is acquainted with the peculiar qualities of fluids and solids can fail to perceive. In the present, also, we find mankind, notwithstanding the diversity of races and occupations, more closely bound together by the ties of interest and of humanity than at any previous time in history. The exclusiveness which once prevailed among families, and later among nations, has in a great measure passed away, and now more than ever before is the fact recognized and felt that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." In the sciences there is in like manner manifested an increased unity and dependence. We now know them to be far more intimately related to one another than centuries ago they were even imagined to be.

But in as much as the same agencies have been at work from the remotest time, we may reasonably infer that they will continue to operate, and that, therefore, what characterizes the present in its relation to the past, will also characterize the relation of the future to the present. Coming years will bring with them ever-increasing diversity, definiteness, and unity in the various physical and intellectual, social, political and religious movements and products in the sphere of time, until the apocalyptic angel whom St. John saw in his sublime vision of the future, standing upon the sea and upon the earth; with hand uplifted to heaven, shall finally proclaim that time shall be no longer. We may therefore confidently expect that in the future there will be greatly increased definiteness of scientific knowledge, and that many important discoveries will yet be added to those already made; that the claims and rights of the individual—whether man or woman—will be more fully recognized, and that governments throughout the world will consequently tend more and more toward the republican form; and that the doctrines of our holy religion will become better and better understood, and more clearly defined and fully es-

tablished. There is also reason to believe that the different departments of Natural Science will be proved to be still more intimately related to each other than has yet been demonstrated, that the different nations of the earth will be more closely confederated, and exercise a more restraining influence over each other, and that the Church, now so sadly divided, will become more fully united than she ever yet has been. At the same time this advancement will be made only as in the past amid the conflicts and disorders engendered by sin, which will continue until Christ shall make His second appearance, when the whole order of this world "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God," and time itself shall end in eternity.

In the way of inference from what has now been advanced in regard to the relation of the present to the past and to the future, I would yet add, in conclusion, that if the views stated be correct, it necessarily follows, that all efforts at re-instating the past must in the end prove a failure, whether it be attempted in Church or State, or even in social life. The forms of the past are not suited to the present, for the present, is not what the past was. As it is unseemly for a man to act as a child, even so are the forms of the past unseemly in the present. Such forms did their work and have rightly been buried. It is a wrong to them, a wrong to the present to disentomb them. At best they can now be only unsightly mummies.

So it is also in vain for us to think of legislating and establishing permanent forms of any kind for all coming time. What suits one generation will often not suit another at all. Each age, as it is necessarily different from all others, has wants of its own which it alone can understand and provide for, and any effort on our part to do the work of those who shall come after us, must, therefore, in the very nature of the case, be ineffectual in the accomplishing of its purpose. The only way in which we can truly advance the cause of truth and righteousness in the future, is by performing properly the duties of the present.

ART. V.—THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.

BY REV. D. Y. HEISLER, A. M., MT. ALTO, PA.

PRINCIPLES control and shape the destiny of man. They are the governing forces in the history of our race. Thoughts, feelings, sentiments, according as they are either good or bad, virtuous or vicious, give form and shape to our life, and impart to its varied phenomena the quality of strength or weakness, of beauty or deformity. Actions, in fact, are but the outward expression of hidden forces—of cherished sentiments within. Correct views and principles, accordingly, are of the first importance, especially in the highest and holiest sphere of life—in the kingdom of grace.

The views or sentiments which we entertain of the Church determine, to a very large extent, our life and conduct—our bearing in God's House. The two things stand intimately related to each other, and cannot well be separated. They, who think lightly of the Church, will generally be found triflers in the Sanctuary; while they, whose views of the Church are of an elevated, enlightened and refined cast, will be likely to maintain a correspondingly lofty, yet modest and devout bearing in God's House, and demean themselves with becoming reverence in the place where God's name is recorded and where His honor dwelleth. No wonder, then, that the holy apostle was so anxious that his son Timothy should be well instructed in the nature and office of the Church, not even forgetting him at a distance, and amidst the hardships of his long and wearisome journey. After giving him a most beautiful and graphic picture of a Christian bishop, he proceeds to say: "These things I write unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly;

but, if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the House of God, WHICH IS THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH."

To ministers of the Gospel, especially, as well as to church members generally, this beautiful passage, as also the entire Epistle, is replete with interest; containing, as it does, a number of excellent practical counsels and directions addressed to *Timothy*, and, through him, to all office-bearers in the Church. Paul, it seems, had left him in Ephesus, a city of Asia Minor, to have charge of the churches in that region of country, and to exercise a general supervision over them during his own absence on a missionary tour to Macedon. Fearing that he might possibly be delayed beyond his expectations, and apprehending evil results in case it should so happen, he wrote him this Epistle, hoping that it would supply in part, at least, the place of a personal interview. In the above-cited passage, he states the object of the Epistle, and of its counsels and directions, which was to show the young and inexperienced Timothy how he ought to behave himself in the "House of God;" and, in order to impress him with the *importance* of the subject, he goes on to give him a description or definition of the house of God, which is, says he, "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth"—thus linking his demeanor in the Sanctuary with the superior dignity and importance of the Church as a divine institution. The kingdom of God, as here represented, wears a two-fold aspect. As it looks back to its divine origin, nature and form, or in its relation to the Almighty, it is "the Church of the living God;" as it looks forward to its end or office, or in its relation to the world, it is "the pillar and ground of the truth:" and, now, *these two ideas*, which lie in the very conception of God's house, are to regulate the conduct of Timothy, and so also of all others in the Church, whether as officers or private members simply—"that thou mayest *know* how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God."

In the treatment of this subject, therefore, I shall, in the first place, offer some remarks on the nature and import of this

title or phrase: "House of God;" then show in what sense it is "the Church of the living God," and, as *such*, "the pillar and ground of the truth;" and, in the last place, I shall point out some things which should characterize the conduct and bearing of all those who are in the "House of God," either as office-bearers or as private members.

First, then, the import of the *title* by which the Church of Christ is here designated—"House of God"—what is its meaning? The term house (οἶκος) is usually employed to denote the building in which we live—a literal dwelling-place. In this sense we use the expression, "House of God," to denote the building or house in which God is worshiped, and where He has promised to hold communion with His children, as He Himself has said: "In *all* places, where I record My name, will I come unto thee, and I will bless thee." In this way we speak of the church edifice as the House of God; and even in this lower sense, already the term has something sacred in it; for the place where God's honor dwelleth, and where His name is recorded, is a *holy* place, and as such it ought to make us feel as did Jacob, when, waking out of his sleep, he said: "Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not. How dreadful is this place; this is none other but the House of God, and this is the gate of heaven." In the passage under consideration, however, the term "οἶκος" signifies not the building or material structure, but the inmates of the house; and the entire phrase—"House of God"—denotes, therefore, the family of God, the whole body of His children. He is the universal Parent of all them that are called children in heaven and on earth. But this definition is perhaps too general and indefinite; for, in one sense, all men are the children of God, and so *all* men would seem to be included in this house or family. So it undoubtedly would be, if all things continued to be what they once were; but, since the ruinous fall of our race, "we are by nature the children of wrath, even as others; being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise—having no hope and without God in the world." Hence the expression which is here em-

ployed—"House of God"—is so explained as to limit its meaning and confine it to a certain class of men only, and also to point out their office and calling: "The House of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." What, then, is the difference between the two phrases?

The term CHURCH (ἐκκλησία), as here employed, is more specific and limited in its meaning. It signifies an assembly or convocation, or, literally, an *election*—an assembly of persons who have not only been called together, in a lawful way, but an assembly of men who have been "*called out*"—out of the world and its corrupt fellowship, and organized into a separate and distinct body, for the accomplishment of separate and distinct ends, in the use of peculiar and divinely-ordained means and ordinances. "For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." Peter also distinguishes the "Elect" from the faithless and disobedient, in these remarkable words: "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvelous light."

But it is "the CHURCH of the LIVING GOD." Perhaps this descriptive term "living," as applied to God, is intended still further to define, and give a more specific designation to the Church, as a *living* body—"chosen to everlasting life"—by its union with the living God. Men naturally are "dead in trespasses and in sins," but in Jesus Christ are "made alive again." Once we *all* were "the children of wrath, even as others; but God, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us

together with Christ, and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." Hence Peter, speaking of Christians, says—that, "coming unto Christ, as unto a living stone, *they*, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." And Paul finishes this beautiful picture by saying: "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."

These explanations of the titles by which the family of God is designated—"House of God" and "Church of the living God"—will enable us to understand fully, and duly to appreciate the interesting nature of the Church of Christ. It is an "ELECTION"—not a common multitude indiscriminately gathered together. She—"the Church of the living God"—is of royal descent, of divine origin, and of supernatural constitution, invested with peculiar gifts and graces; and, along with other ensigns of royalty, destined to wear a diadem of pure gold. Many indeed are "called," but few only are "chosen;" and the Church of God is that "chosen generation," that "peculiar people," whom God has graciously espoused to Himself in an "everlasting covenant." These are precious to Him "as the apple of His eye," and "graven on His hand." It is true that in the Church visible there are many who bear but the name of disciples; and all men, who are truly interested in the Church's prosperity, sincerely regret and bewail this state of things; but they know also, that, however numerous are the hypocrites in "the congregation of the saints," it is yet in the deepest sense of the term "the Church of the living God"—the "ELECT LADY"—of whom the apostle John so highly speaks. These precious "plants of righteousness" are God's peculiar treasure. They are "the temple of

the living God;" as God hath said: "I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people."

These familiar explanations and remarks on the "House of God" will also enable us to understand the deep solemnity and importance of the Church's calling. As a "chosen generation" and a "peculiar people," Christians are "to show forth the praises of Him who hath called them out of darkness into His marvelous light;" and, as a "royal priesthood," they are to "offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." What an important office are they to fill, whose work is—to make known to a dying world the riches of God's grace and mercy—to be "the salt of the earth" and "the light of the world"—to be "a city, that is set on a hill," and "cannot be hid." In view of this infinitely important calling, "the Church of the living God" is said to be "THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH."

This title of "the House of God" designates the Church's official character—the relation which it sustains to the world. The language, it will be observed, is figurative, and we must therefore try to ascertain its meaning. "Pillars"—*στύλοι*—may be said to serve two general purposes. The few notices, which we have of them in primitive times, show that in the earliest ages of the world, already they were employed as *historical monuments*, set up in memory of some person, action, or important event. So the temerity of Lot's wife was punished by her being turned into a "pillar of salt," as a perpetual monument of God's wrath. "Salt" is the emblem of perpetuity—of imperishableness; and her being suddenly transformed, by a divine judgment, into a "pillar of salt," signifies that her sad and fearful doom is to stand upon record as a permanent historic fact, to bear witness "that God is a just God and true, and that He will in no wise clear the guilty," in order to warn the unfaithful, the doubting, the apostate, against venturing on a similar experiment with the Almighty; for it is written: "Remember Lot's wife;" and, as long as the everlasting Gospel shall continue, so long too shall this solemn

sentence stand upon its sacred pages as a warning to the wicked!

Under circumstances precisely the opposite, Jacob set up a "pillar," as a monument of God's mercy. When, on a certain occasion, tarrying all night under the open heavens, he dreams —"and, behold, a ladder set upon the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it: and Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone which he had put for his *pillow*, and set it up for a PILLAR, and poured oil on the top of it; and called the name of that place BETHEL—that is, the House of God." Here we have a vision of the Spirit-world mercifully granted unto Jacob; and, to perpetuate the memory of this remarkable event, he sets up a *monumental* pillar, which, in *history* at least, has ever since stood as a beacon-light to support, and silently to publish the truth respecting God's gracious manifestation of Himself to the children of men, from age to age, as circumstances require. It was intended to be, and is well adapted to serve as a sacred memorial of God's grace and mercy.

Of like import was the *pillar* of "twelve stones" set up by order of Joshua. The stones were taken from the bed of the Jordan, which had just been crossed by the hosts of Israel, and were set up in a *circle*, to commemorate this remarkable event. It was to be a "sign" among the Israelites, that, when their children should ask them, in time to come, saying—"what mean these stones?" they were to answer them, "that the waters of Jordan were cut off before the ark of the covenant of the Lord." And "these stones shall be for a MEMORIAL unto the children of Israel forever;" or, in other words, this circular heap of stones was to be a *monument* to preserve in the minds of the people, and to perpetuate to all future generations the memory of this event—this act of divine interposition. These "twelve stones," each representing one of the tribes of Israel, were an expressive symbol of God's universal Church—of ZION, which literally signifies something raised up, as a heap of stones, a pillar or monument.

These examples are sufficient to show what important purposes the "pillar" may serve when employed in the way of *historical monument.* The application is easy. The Church is the standing monument of God's mercy and grace in the world—a "living Epistle, known and read of all men," and perpetually "holding forth the word of life."

At first, these monumental pillars were always erected in those places, where the events, that were to be commemorated, had occurred. In the course of time, however, they were set up, *occasionally*, at least, in connection with some public building; or the "pillars" of an edifice, already erected, were simply furnished with some suitable inscription, and in this way made to answer the purposes of a monument. Hence the PILLAR came to be extensively employed as the symbol of strength and beauty—of ornament and support. So James, Peter and John, it is said, "seemed to be pillars" in the Church, because they were the most eminent among the apostles—the founders of the Church—and constituted its chief ornament and support: and Jesus Christ, in His Epistles to the seven churches of Asia, says: "Him, that overcometh, will I make a pillar in the temple of My God, and he shall go no more out; and I will write upon him the name of My God, and the name of the city of My God, which is the new Jerusalem; which cometh down out of heaven from My God; and I will write upon him My new name."

When employed in architecture, "pillars" are always, and naturally the stay, support and ornament of a building; and, it would seem, that, in some instances at least, they literally sustained the building, so that without them the superstructure could not stand. As an illustration of this fact, I need but refer to the celebrated temple of Dagon among the Philistines. It was in this temple that the haughty Pagans were assembled to celebrate their triumph over the unfortunate Samson. After putting out his eyes, they unfeelingly asked him to make sport for their special benefit and diversion; but he, in his agony, turned to the God of might, who does not forget His injured children, and said: "Strengthen me, I pray Thee,

only this once, O God, that I may be avenged of the Philistines for my two eyes. And Samson took hold of the two *middle pillars* upon which the house stood, and on which it was borne up. And Samson said, Let me die with the Philistines; and he bowed himself with all his might, and the house fell upon the lords of the Philistines, and upon all the people that were therein." It is evident, from this history, that these two "middle pillars" absolutely sustained this magnificent temple; they were the prop and stay of the superstructure. So likewise in the Jewish Temple, Solomon set up two beautiful "pillars"—one on the right and the other on the left of the principal entrance; which, besides being highly ornamental, seem from their names to have served a similar purpose. These pillars were made of brass, surmounted with "chapiters" and ornamented with "checker-work" and "wreaths of chain and lily-work." The one on the right he called *Jachin*, which signifies *stability*, or "he shall establish"—the one on the left he called *Boaz*, which means *strength*, or "strength is in it." All the circumstances connected with the getting up of these magnificent pillars, go to show that they were intended to serve the two-fold purpose of *support and ornament*, or, in other words, to beautify and sustain the superstructure. Both in ancient and modern architecture, the columns or pillars play an important part, and almost always serve this *double* purpose of ornament and support. They are not only the stay and prop—the ornament and beauty—but also the most substantial part, and lasting memorials of the edifices to which they pertain. So important are these "pillars" in perpetuating the memory of the buildings which they sustain and beautify, that, amidst the ruins of ancient cities, after ages of desolation, these noble pillars still remain to testify in solemn, silent, overpowering grandeur of what *once* was, but is now no more! Those splendid superstructures—the work of ages—have been long since shattered to pieces and blown down by the sweeping tornadoes, and their precious materials—treasures, ornaments and inscriptions—scattered and mingled with the desert sands, while the *colossal pillars* still stand as sentinels over the sad

ruins, and in solemn silence recount the melancholy story of their former grandeur!

The *importance* of these remarks will appear in its proper place. All I wish to say in this connection is, that the CHURCH OF CHRIST is "the pillar and ground of the truth," in the same sense *precisely* as the pillars in an edifice are the support and ornament—the perpetuating medium—of the building. It is the prop and stay of the entire system of divine revelation, and the only sure guarantee and infallibly certain and successful medium of its perpetuation in the world!

But, to make things *doubly* sure, and to exclude even the possibility of a mistake, the Apostle employs a *compound* figure, and calls the Church of the living God "the *pillar* and *ground* of the truth." This word "GROUND"—ἑδραίωμα—literally signifies a *foundation*, and is used in connection with the word "pillar" to *strengthen and intensify* its meaning. It agrees, in fact, with the word pillar in its fundamental idea or significance. The original word—ἑδραίωμα—is derived from ἕδρα, a *seat*, and signifies something *settled*, *fixed*, or *firm*, or from the verb ἑδραιόω—to fix firmly, to establish, to make permanent or secure. Its meaning is exceedingly strong and comprehensive. When, therefore, it is employed as a symbol, it signifies a firm *support*, *stay*, or *basis*—literally and in the strongest sense of the term, a FOUNDATION. This identifies it very nearly, as we have already intimated, with the word "pillar." What a good, solid, strong foundation and massive pillars are to the *strength* and *durability* of an edifice, that "the Church of the living God" is to the truth—its support and basis, namely, and the only *sure* guarantee of its purity and continued maintenance in the earth. The Church is, in the deepest and truest sense of the terms, "the pillar and ground of the truth."

This thought—the prevailing idea of the apostle's language, which, in substance at least, forms the caption of our article—I shall now proceed to illustrate and confirm. And, in the

first place, it is proved by the nature and office of the Church, as represented by Jesus Christ in His sermon on the mount.

"YE ARE THE SALT OF THE EARTH," says our divine Lord. The nature and properties of salt are such as to make it the emblem or symbol of perpetuity. It contains within itself the elements of imperishableness, and likewise has the capacity to communicate these conservative properties to foreign substances, and so to preserve them from decay. So likewise the Church, as the "body of Christ," contains within itself, by divine gift, the elements of eternal life. She only, as the subject and bearer of a divine imperishable life, possesses the true principle of *stability*, and gives life and immortality to her children. Standing in vital union and communion with her risen Lord, she partakes really and savingly of His blessed life. "Because I live," says the Redeemer, "ye shall live also;" and "Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." This is "the *mystery*, which hath been hid from ages and from generations," says Paul, "but now is made manifest to His saints—which is, Christ in you the hope of glory." On the confession of Peter: "Thou art the Son of the living God," Jesus answered and said: "Upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." And, "the kingdom of God is in you"—permanently in you, as the leaven of eternal life to the world. "Ye are the salt of the earth."

AGAIN: "YE ARE THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD." What does this mean, except that the Church is the *bearer of light*, and the rightful dispenser of it to the world. The children—numerous as the sands upon the sea-shore, and countless as the stars of heaven—are all "the children of light." Once indeed they were *darkness*, but now they are "light in the Lord." And hence they are exhorted to be "blameless and harmless, the sons of God without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom," says the apostle, "ye shine as lights—luminaries—in the world; holding forth the word of life." By some the allusion, in this passage, is

supposed to be to the luminaries of heaven—the sun, and moon, and stars; others conjecture that there is a reference to the ancient "light-houses." The original word—φωστῆρες—in fact signifies watch-fires, guard-lights or beacons. Whatever be the immediate reference, the meaning evidently is—that Christians, as a body, are to be luminaries—light-bearers—in the world, set in the spiritual firmament for its benefit and safety. Hence Jesus Christ says: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

Let us endeavor still further to illustrate and confirm this peculiarity of the Church's nature and influence—its perpetuity and usefulness—as they are found to be involved in the conception of a "*city that is set on a hill*," *and* "*cannot be hid.*" What is the force—the meaning and import of this figure? It is clearly this—that the Church, as a compact body, is to serve the double purpose of being a living monument of God's mercy and faithfulness, in the past, and a spiritual hospital—a house of refuge for penitents in all time to come—the conservator of all that is beautiful and good in the world—"the pillar and ground of the truth"—the perpetual guarantee of its continuance, purity and ultimate triumph among men!

This "city of God" is on a "hill"—occupying a position so elevated, and surrounded with an atmosphere so pure, that she is always visible, and fully in sight from all parts of the earth. Far removed from the low-lands of sin and vice, she is not only not affected by the *incumbent* fog and mist, which lie, so cold and heavy, upon the cities of the plain, but basks perpetually in the pure, unclouded sun-light of heaven. The symbol of the Divine presence is in her midst—a pillar of cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night; and, being thus made luminous in the Lord, she stands a moral *pharos* on the hill-top—a genuine "light-house" in the midst of nature's darkness! In her relation to the *past*, she is a miracle of grace—a standing monument of God's mercy and love—the fairest trophy of "the truth as it is in Jesus"—the accumulated sum and evi-

dence of its saving power—and the joy of the Redeemer's heart. She is emphatically the *pillar* of the truth. In her relation to the *future*, the Church is the hope of the world—the genuine, true, and only *infallible* conservator of human society. She is the mystic "woman" who receives from the bountiful hand of her Lord the leaven of eternal life, and mingles it in with the shattered elements of a fallen, sinning, dying world, to arrest the process of its ruin, and to restore it to God, and to eternal life and felicity. From these remarks on the city of God—the home of the redeemed—the refuge of penitents—the hospital of the diseased—it is evident that she is, in the deepest and most real sense, "the pillar and ground of the truth."

But, in the second place, the high distinction of the Church is proven by her efficient character or calling. She is, by divine right and appointment, the *Depositary and Guardian* of the truth—to whom are committed "the oracles of God." Paul, in allusion to Israel, says: "What advantage, then, hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly because, that unto them—the Jews—were committed the oracles of God." And even their unfaithfulness did not invalidate this appointment. The care and keeping of family treasures are not usually committed to strangers; nor is it left to the uncertainty and precariousness of mere chance to provide for their safe keeping; much less are they entrusted to the perilous guardianship of openly avowed and professed enemies. They are put into a place of security, under lock and key, and these deposited in safe hands. So Jesus Christ says: "On this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto *you*"—chosen and attested heralds of the cross—"the keys of the kingdom of heaven"—the symbols of authority and stewardship. Hence Paul says: "Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God."

This is one item in the Divine Economy, and the wisdom of this arrangement is seen in the extraordinary care and solici-

tude with which the Church has always guarded these inestimable treasures. Every student of history knows how sacredly and with what pious care she concealed the word and sacraments from the rude gaze and profane touch of the infuriate pagans, who maliciously watched for the destruction of the one, and the profanation of the other. It is well known with what inconceivable labor and painful solicitude, she had the sacred books—the holy Bible—transcribed, and, in order to secure them from being plundered, she piously chained them to her altars. When afterwards the art of printing was discovered, she diligently labored to multiply copies of it, and to circulate them among her children, until, in our day, the entire Christian world is supplied with copies of the book of life. In view of this important service rendered to her beloved children, by the Church, she deserves eminently to be called "the pillar and ground of the truth."

AGAIN: the Church is appointed to preach the everlasting Gospel and administer its sealing ordinances. "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying: All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth: go ye, therefore, and teach (disciple) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world;" or, as St. Mark has it: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." The solemnity and importance of this commission are seen in the circumstances attending the Apostles' inauguration in their sacred office. On the evening of His resurrection, "being the first day of the week," the disciples were assembled for public worship, and Jesus came and stood in their midst, and said unto them, "Peace be unto you; and when He had so said He showed unto them His hands and His side; and the disciples were glad when they saw the Lord. Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on

them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them: and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." And immediately before His ascension to heaven He once more said unto them: "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." So runs the Redeemer's promise: the verification follows soon after. "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them: and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Such was the solemn inauguration of the heralds of the cross, when sent forth to preach the gospel and administer its sealing ordinances. They were the divinely commissioned and divinely qualified bearers of life and salvation to the nations—the official organs of "the House of God, which is the Church of the living God, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH." Without her agency, as thus arranged by the Lord Himself, the gospel of the grace of God could neither have been securely guarded and preserved nor preached among the nations, nor could the holy sacraments have been rightly dispensed, and so the kingdom of God extended and established in the earth.

We observe again, that the Church, and she *alone*, has the guarantee of Christ's presence, and of the guidance of the Holy Ghost. Instruments for the conservation and spread of the gospel were in due time appointed by the Lord and qualified for their important work; and when at length He had given them the great commission, He added: "And, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." A blessed assurance; and for what purpose was this promise given? Undoubtedly to sustain the faith of His servants in the prosecution of their arduous and responsible work. They—the Apostles—were the

laborers, the builders, the cultivators of the soil; but Christ Himself by His presence and power sustained the instruments and gave efficiency and success to their commission—their efforts to build up the Church. He is the strength of His saints. "For where two or three are gathered together in My name," says Christ, "there am I in the midst of them." In every Christian assembly, in every church council—in every department of His moral vineyard, is Jesus found, "walking in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks"—the expressive symbol of God's holy Church Catholic. And then to complete and render absolutely effective the means of their support, and to guarantee to them ample success in their important work, He promises them the uninterrupted guidance of the Holy Ghost.

Highly significant and instructive is the assurance given to His Apostles by our Divine Redeemer: "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you." He had indeed carefully instructed them in "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." He had time and again corrected their misapprehensions of the truth, and in every possible way sought to instruct them in the doctrines and practices of our holy religion; but all this was not sufficient to secure them, and the church in coming ages, against fatal aberrations from the truth; and hence, when He was about to leave them, He, in the way of a parting gift, said: "I will not leave you comfortless"—orphans—"I will come to you" again. "And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter"—*παράκλητος*, counsellor—"that He may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the WORLD cannot receive." Again: "These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you: but the COMFORTER, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, HE shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." And again: "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you," from the Father, "HE shall testify of me. And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with Me from the beginning." And then He concludes: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now: howbeit, when

He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth."

Now, observe in reference to these promises of divine guidance, that they are all made *exclusively* to the Church, and that the Spirit's presence with the Church is to be *perpetual.* Hear what our great High-priest saith: "I will pray the Father, and He shall give YOU"—the holy Apostles, and the Church, whose organs they are—"Another Comforter, that He may abide with you FOREVER, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the *world* cannot receive, because it knoweth Him not; but YE know Him, for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."

And this Divine guide is to *teach* the ministry, or, if you prefer it, the whole body of believers, and to bring *all* things to their remembrance, whatsoever Christ has taught them. He is to testify of Christ, and to guide His Church into all truth.

Here then, is the *basis* of our faith in the Church's stability, and of our confidence strong and firm, in the ultimate and complete triumph of the truth in her hands. In our doubts and perplexities we look with joyous confidence to this tower of strength—the CHURCH, "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone"—assured that in her peaceful palaces, "God is found for a refuge," and that we shall always find succor and support in communion with Him who is her glorious and ever-living Head. "For we have not an high-priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Other and inferior priests have lived, and labored, and died; "but this man hath an unchangeable priesthood," says Paul, "wherefore He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He *ever* liveth to make intercession for them."

And should we ever be challenged for the evidence of His extraordinary history—of His incarnation, birth and life of obedience,—of His death and resurrection—of His ascension to heaven and exaltation at the right hand of God,—should we ever be so challenged, we shall at once confidently point the proud scoffer to Zion, the "city of our God," and tell him

there, sir, there is the evidence for "the truth as it is in Jesus." Just as our own noble Republic is the very *best*, strongest, and most comprehensive evidence for the continued existence and prevalence of those great *political* principles, for which our brave and virtuous ancestors lived, and bled, and died, so *precisely* also is "the Church of the living God, *the pillar and ground* of the truth"—the living body of believers—the very best, strongest, and most comprehensive evidence for the great *Spiritual* principles contained in her ancient and venerable Creeds and heroically confessed and defended by a long and brilliant line of her noble martyrs, confessors, and saints, shining down through the ages like a stream of fire! "Glorious things are spoken of Zion, the city of God." She is the perfection of beauty—the joy of the whole earth—the prop and stay of society! In the beautiful palaces of yonder "City," perched upon the "hill of God," are the living, moving, imperishable records of our *faith and hope;* and in her massive walls and luminous towers are the "tested" guarantees of the world's redemption. On her bloody banner, waving high and triumphant over the shattered works of a dying world, stands the ancient and abiding motto: "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." And, down over its shining battlements, come the mellowed voices of ten thousand times ten thousand saints—each wearing a crown of gold—saying: "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father —to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever: Amen."

Such is the character and such are the inhabitants of "the city of our God"—the New Jerusalem. No wonder that the aged and venerable Paul, the Apostle of Christ and Champion of His cause, should have manifested so much and such deep concern about his beloved Timothy and his conduct in "the House of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." And we also, "as ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God," should manifest at least an equal concern for the purity of the Church and the consistency of her children.

Let me then, beloved fathers and brethren in the ministry, and all ye who are "called to be saints," state yet, in conclusion and by way of personal application, some few things in reference to the conduct which becomes us respectively in "the House of God," whether as office-bearers or private members simply, but especially as "ministers of Christ." Your own sense of duty and Christian propriety will readily suggest to your minds the things most eminently becoming "the ambassadors of God"—the heralds of the cross. Hence it is not at all necessary to detain the readers with many words. Each one can best judge for himself, after what has already been said, what is required of us as the servants of Christ. I shall, therefore, simply state and briefly illustrate such points as the Epistle itself suggests.

FIRST,—We should be "sound in the faith," (1 Tim. iii. 9), and also "blameless in life" (1 Tim. iii. 2–7); both these items are necessary "that the Word of God be not blasphemed." For, if it be true, as we know it is, that our practical life and conduct are the legitimate fruit of our religious principles—our faith—then we see at once how infinitely important it is that we should be sound at heart—"holding the mystery of the Faith in a pure conscience," and so endeavoring also to "keep the heart with all diligence, since out of it are the issues of life." And if it be true also, that our principles and the cause we espouse will be judged by the conduct which we exhibit, then we can see also why it is so highly important to the cause of Christ, that we, and each of us who are its defenders and promulgators, should be "vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach, not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre, not a brawler, not covetous, one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; not a novice, lest, being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil." Such is the picture drawn by the pen of divine inspiration, of a genuine Christian bishop—a servant of Christ. "As ye have, therefore, received Christ Jesus, the Lord, so walk ye in Him,

rooted and built up in Him, and established in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving."

SECONDLY,—We should be faithful, earnest and persevering in the discharge of our respective duties, both as pastors and members of the flock. Diligence in the prosecution of our work, and obedience, ready and cheerful, to all God's commands, united with meekness and simplicity, will accomplish wonders. Hence the earnest entreaty of St. Paul: "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority—that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty; for this is good, and acceptable in the sight of God, our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." This salvation of men is to be effected instrumentally by honest and Christian consistency. But especially as office-bearers and in an official way are we to show ourselves faithful and diligent, and so effective in building up God's kingdom, and the maintenance of the truth. Hear the Apostle's solemn charge to his son Timothy; "I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and kingdom, preach the word, be instant in season and out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." And again: "Watch thou in all things; endure afflictions; do the work of an evangelist; make full proof of thy ministry." And here the aged hero—the successful champion of the cross, full of honors, and borne down by the weight of years—inflamed with love, and burning with zeal for his Master's cause—rises to an inestimable majesty, and urges onward the young and inexperienced Timothy by his own glorious example, and by the nearness of his own approaching dissolution. "For I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing."

THIRDLY,—We should be deeply concerned for the continuance, purity, and efficiency of the holy ministry. Much of the Church's prosperity and efficiency will depend on the character of her official organs. Hence the Apostle's exhortation: "These things command and teach. Let no man despise thy youth; but be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity.—Till I come, give attention to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear unto all." And then: "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things, without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality. Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins; keep thyself pure." Again: "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good thing, which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us."—"And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."—"Consider what I say, and the Lord give thee understanding in all things." St. Paul was himself a faithful minister of Christ, and, by his zeal and fidelity, maintained the dignity of the CHURCH—"the pillar and ground of the truth,"—and by earnest efforts also, he sought to leave behind him, after his decease, a band of faithful men, as his successors in the holy office. OUR duty also is, not only, to be faithful and true to our high calling in Christ Jesus, but to see to it that there may always be a succession of "good men and true," to have charge of "the mystery of God," when we are gone!

FOURTHLY,—We should diligently cultivate the entire garden of the Lord, removing the evil and cherishing what is good and useful. This duty belongs to all Christians, but more particularly so to the officers or ministers of the Church. They are set for the defence of the gospel, for the promulgation of the

truth, for the encouragement of the sincere and penitent, for the comfort of saints, and for the correction of the disobedient and perverse. "And, if we are thus true to our high and holy calling, if we contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," and if, in the discharge of our solemn obligations, we neglect neither ourselves nor others, the Lord Himself will graciously assist us in our "labor of love and work of faith," and, in the day of Christ's coming, many precious souls shall be given to us, to serve as abiding seals to our ministry, and to shine as stars in the crown of our rejoicing. May all those, therefore, who are called to minister at the altar, so live and so demean themselves as becometh those that are counted worthy to be servants in "THE HOUSE OF GOD, WHICH IS THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH."

ART. VI.—THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT IN THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED CHURCHES.

BY CHAS. P. KRAUTH, D.D.,
Norton Professor of Theology in the E. L. Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, and Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in the University of Pennsylvania.

THE great body of intelligent Presbyterian clergymen in this country is, we believe, either passive on the question of a liturgy, or in various degrees favorable to the use of Church forms, with a certain degree of freedom. The Presbyterian Church is, indeed, in its earlier history, as completely committed to the general principle of a Liturgy as either the Anglican or Lutheran Church. The facts of that history have been brought out in several recent works from Presbyterian hands.* The most valuable of them is the book by Dr. Shields.

* 1. Eutaxia, or the Presbyterian Liturgies: Historical Sketches. By a Minister of the Presbyterian Church. "And this I speak," &c. 1 Cor. vii. 35. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1855. 12mo. pp. 260.

2. A book of public prayer. Compiled from the authorized formularies of worship

It is indeed one of the most interesting and important liturgical works which have appeared for a long time. It is a welcome evidence how truth re-asserts her rights, and overcomes the deepest prejudices. From one of the most finished scholars in the Presbyterian Church, which is so rich in such men; from Princeton, that old fortress of the Calvinistic faith; from a professor in Nassau Hall, among the standard bearers in a great host, comes this important work, testifying to one great, fundamental, practical principle of the Reformation, on which the Calvinists stood as firmly as the Lutherans, to wit, that a fixed order of service best comported with the public worship of God, and was best adapted to the edification of His people. The book which Dr. Shields edits is an adaptation of the Common Prayer Book of the Church of England to the doctrines and preferences of the Presbyterian Church. It is executed in that pure taste which distinguishes everything which comes from the hands of its gifted author; and we hope it will in various ways work usefully in the Presbyterian Church. Distinct from the Prayer Book, yet closely connected with it, is a historical appendix: "Liturgia Expurgata; or the Prayer Book Amended, according to the Presbyterian Revision of 1661, and historically and critically reviewed." This liturgical history is singularly rich in the fruits of a wide range of investigation. It brings together as we have never seen them brought together before, the materials for a judgment as to the real attitude of the Presbyterian Church to the liturgical question. But it does more than this. It is a moderate and qualified, yet very powerful plea for the use of a liturgical directory. The chapters on ministerial and congregational neglects in

of the Presbyterian Church, as prepared by the Reformers Calvin, Knox, Bucer and others. With supplementary forms. New York: Chas. Scribner. 1857. 12mo. pp. xxiii. 360.

3. (A Manual of Worship, suitable to be used in Legislative and other public bodies, in the army, &c. Compiled from the forms and in accordance with the common usages of all Christian denominations, &c. Philadelphia: George W. Childs. 1862. 18mo. pp.).

4. The Book of Common Prayer, as amended by the Westminster Divines, A. D. 1661. Edited by Charles W. Shields, D.D. With a historical and liturgical treatise. Philadelphia: James S. Claxton. 1867. 12mo. pp. xxiv. 637. 188.

public worship are admirable; and indeed the whole book is so worthy of attentive perusal, that we can only say that we hope none of our readers interested in the great liturgical questions of the day will fail to read Dr. Shields' work for themselves. We must venture, however, to express a modest dissent from Dr. Shields on one or two historical points, in which the Lutheran Church is concerned. In his desire of making out the "Book of Common Prayer" as thoroughly Calvinistic as possible, we think he has been unconsciously biassed in his views. It is acknowledged by all who are familiar with the history of the Episcopal Liturgy, that it owes a large part of its beauty and fullness to the "Consultation" which was drawn up in 1543 by Melancthon and Bucer, by invitation of Hermann, Bishop of Cologne.* This Lutheran liturgy Dr. Shields is inclined to claim as in some sort Calvinistic ("with a bias toward Calvinism"), and in this we are compelled to regard him as mistaken. The *liturgy* of Cologne is simply and purely Lutheran.

1. Melancthon and Bucer were both Lutherans. However mild, irenical, and even unionistic they might be, they were both adherents of the Augsburg Confession, declaring that they held it from the heart as their faith. Bucer signed the Augsburg Confession in 1532. In the Wittenberg Concord of 1536, Bucer came to a full concord with Luther in the faith, even to the last point of contest, "that the unworthy truly take the body and blood of Christ, though to their own judgment." At the consummation of this Concord, Bucer and Capito shed tears of joy. "From the year 1536," says Diefenbach, "Bucer was thoroughly Lutheran;" and Schenkel, who would gladly have reached another conclusion, says: "That in the Wittenberg Concord, Bucer ceased to hold his earlier conviction, that he was overcome by Luther's authority, and that his zeal for union carried him away to the recantation of the Swiss doctrine, is a fact which no sophistry can set aside."

---

* 1. Hermann's einfaltigs bedencken, &c. Anno A. D. xliiii. (Marpurg durch Anthonium Tirolt). 4to. Fol. ccxxii. (In the Library of the writer).

2. Richter: Kirchenordnung. xvi. Cent. No. lxxxi.

(Herzog, Real Enc. art. Bucer). The most violent feeling was aroused against Bucer among the Reformed on the Continent, and he was styled in bitter sarcasm: "Luther's Cardinal a latere."

Lathbury shows that Bucer was the object of intense hatred to many of the Calvinists in England, because of his adherence to the doctrine (to use Bucer's own words) of "the real and substantial presence of Christ in the Sacrament," in which doctrine he remained steadfast to his death. Guericke says: "Bucer went to England, and even there held firmly to the pure Evangelical" (Lutheran) "doctrine; deeply deploring its imperilling by the rationalizing tendency which prevailed." In 1537, among the "Doctors and preachers who subscribed the Augsburg Confession and its apology," appears the name of Martin Bucer, attached to the Appendix to the Smalcald Articles. Melancthon says to Luther (1543), "Both Bucer and Pistorius teach purely and rightly."*

That Melancthon and Bucer were on terms of personal friendship with Calvin, no more proves them to be Calvinists than our hearty admiration of Dr. Shields makes us a Calvinist. Calvin never praised either of them as ardently as he did Luther; and it is pretty well settled that Luther was not a Calvinist—although more largely than many imagine Calvin was a Lutheran. The other laborers in the Cologne Reformation were all Lutherans. Hedio,† was the pupil of Melancthon, the personal friend of Luther, and preacher and professor of Theology in the Lutheran city, Strassburg. Pistorius was the Lutheran pastor of Nidde, in Ober Hesse. Sarcer was one of the great Lutheran theologians.

2. Luther never made any objection to the *Liturgy* of Cologne. Luther read hastily only so much of the Consultation as referred to this one point, of the Lord's Supper, with his mind in a general state of excitement from recent assaults on the part of the Zuinglians. He objected simply and solely to the *ambiguity* of certain phrases in the doctrinal statements in

* Corp. Ref. v. 112.

† Corp. Ref. v. 150.

regard to the Lord's Supper, which are wholly distinct from the Liturgy. Luther's own form of service was the basis of it, and of its whole class of liturgies, and its immediate sources were, mainly: first, the Brandenburg-Nurenburg Liturgy of 1533, and, secondly, the Saxon of 1539; both of which belong to the greatest and most widely used Lutheran liturgies of the Sixteenth century. Its third source is the Cassel order of 1539, also Lutheran. The doctrinal portion of it was prepared in part only by Melancthon. What relates to the Lord's Supper was written by Bucer. Luther was speedily satisfied with Melancthon's defence of his own cause, and two years after, Bucer's fuller statement of his doctrine of the Sacrament brought about a reconciliation with Luther.

3. The Liturgy of Cologne, in its whole character, is distinctively Lutheran.

Its formularies are Lutheran; the Baptismal prayer and rite, for example, are from Luther's Taufbuchlein; its order of private baptism is from the Saxon service of 1539; its exhortation at Communion, and Collects, from the Nurenburg of 1533; its Litany is Luther's translation and adaptation, and the Litany Collects are just as he prepared and arranged them.

When, on page 102, Dr. Shields gives the new and beautiful parts of the Litany which he thinks "*due to Bucer*," he simply quotes Luther's Litany, which is transferred to the Cologne Order.*

---

* The Cologne Litany in our copy (1544) is verbatim that of Luther, with these exceptions:

Luther.	Cologne.
Sohn	Sun (misprint)
Blut	Blutvergiessung
By thy cross and death	omits (probably misprint)
all *his* Enemies.	all *God's* Enemies.

The Cologne adds these Collects to the Litany:

1. O God, merciful Father, who despisest not the sighing of a contrite heart; or, Luther's first Latin Litany Collect. First in Church of England series. Third in the Church Book
2. Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who desirest not the death of a sinner; or, Luther's first German Litany Collect. Third Latin. First in Church Book.
3. Almighty God, who knowest us to be set in the midst of so many and great dangers. Luther's Fourth Latin Collect. Fourth in the Church Book.

4. In those very respects in which Calvinism most vehemently and characteristically is arrayed against Lutheranism, it is anti-Calvinistic and Lutheran. It retains, for instance, exorcism (stripped of its superstitions) in Baptism, the renunciation of the Devil; it enjoins the making of the Cross on the brow and breast of the child; it allows the singing of Psalms in Latin; it has antiphons and responses throughout; retaining the rite of Confirmation, private Confession and Absolution, the singing of the Creed, the Preface in the Communion, the Sanctus and Benedictus; the singing of the words of the Institution by the minister—whom it constantly calls the priest, the Agnus Dei, the Old Testament Benediction. In fact, it is one of the amplest and most carefully arranged Lutheran liturgies of its century. We are almost sorry that a book which has so largely influenced Dr. Shields' liturgical offering to his church has so much on which thorough Calvinists of the old type will look with more than suspicion.

5. There has been hardly a diversity of opinion as to where Hermann's Liturgy belongs. All the older writers place it among the Lutheran liturgies.

Hilles, in a letter to Bullinger (June 4, 1549), says: "We have a uniform Communion service throughout the whole kingdom, after the manner of the Nuremburg and Saxon Churches. The bishop and magistrates put no stumbling-block in the way of the Lutherans."*

Melancthon, in writing to Luther (May 19, 1543), says: "That the Bishop (Hermann) had commanded that the formula of doctrine and of rites shall be conformed to that of Nuremburg." (Corp. Ref. v. 112.) "It agrees with (that of) our churches." Do. 160.

Proctor† says of "The Prayer Book of Edward VI," "Some of the more extreme faction of the Reformers found fault with it, on the ground that it was tinged with Lutheranism." "Of all the foreigners who were engaged in the work of Ref-

* Original Letters (Parker Society), CXXI.

† History of Book of Common Prayer. Cambridge. 1860. pp. 26, 38, 39 and 40.

ormation, Melancthon and Luther had the greatest influence in the composition of the English Book of Common Prayer. The first book was largely indebted to Luther, who had composed a form of service in 1533. The Litany" [which was Luther's] "presents many striking affinities with the amended English Litany of 1554. The exhortations in the Communion Service (1548 and 1549), and portions of the Baptismal Services, are mainly due to this book (Hermann's), through which the influence of Luther may be traced in our Prayer Book, where additions or considerable changes were made in translating the old Latin services." Proctor points out more than thirty particulars in which this book influenced the Book of Common Prayer. Lathbury says: "All our Reformers were united in bonds of amity with the Lutherans, and had the "Confession of Augsburg," and the "Simple Consultation of Hermann," before them: the former in preparing the Articles, the latter in compiling the Book of Common Prayer."

Daniel* not only places it among Lutheran Liturgies, but in a note upon its baptismal service, directs attention to the prevailing character of the Calvinistic Service in contrast with this thoroughly Lutheran Service of Cologne. Even Dr. Shields seems to furnish evidence against his own position, when, to prove that it was "compiled from *Reformed* as well as Lutheran sources," he says in his note, "from the Formularies of Nuremberg (Lutheran), Saxony (Lutheran), Strassburg (Reformed), and Hesse (Reformed)," for, in the first place, the Formularies of Nuremberg and Saxony were overwhelmingly predominant, and in the second place, Strassburg and Hesse were, in 1543, not Reformed, but Lutheran. Hesse did not become Calvinistic till 1604, and even after the change, retained a decidedly Lutheranizing liturgy. Nor is the statement correct that Hesse furnished materials for the Cologne Liturgy: the relation was exactly the reverse. Strassburg received the Augsburg Confession in 1532, and never became Calvinistic.

6. Dr. Shields is mistaken in saying "it was never used nor

* Codex Liturgicus, Vol. II. x, and p. 202.

sanctioned in any Lutheran community." It was one of the sources of the Austrian Agenda of 1571, and was for some considerable time in use in Hesse.* Its chief sources, the Nuremberg and Saxon Orders, were the most influential and widely used of the Lutheran Liturgies of the Sixteenth century.

7. The chief objection to it from Lutheran sources—made not against the liturgical parts, but against its polity and spirit, was not that it had a Calvinistic bearing, but that it was not sufficiently marked in its anti-Romish features.†

In "Eutaxia" is given a history of the Calvinistic Liturgies, and in the "Book of Public Prayer," is presented a number of the forms that have been authorized in the Reformed Churches. Both works have been prepared with much care, and are very valuable to the Student of Liturgics.

"ORDER OF WORSHIP" IN THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH.

The most recent movements in the German Reformed Church,‡ for such we are compelled still to call it, to avoid

---

* Richter, K. O. II. 30.

† Seckendorf. B. III. 437.

‡ 1. Psalms and Hymns, for the use of the German Reformed Church in the United States of America. Published by the Synod of the said Church. 1854. 57th edit. 1869. Philadelphia: 18mo. pp. 636.

2. A Liturgy; or order of Christian worship. Prepared and published by the direction and for the use of the German Reformed Church in the United States of America. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1858. 8vo. pp. 340. 68.

3. The Liturgical Question, with reference to the provisional Liturgy of the German Reformed Church. A report by the "Liturgical Committee." Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1862. 12mo. pp. iv. 72.

4. An Order of Worship for the Reformed Church. Philadelphia: S. R. Fisher & Co. 1867. 8vo. pp. 388.

5. The Revised Liturgy. A History and Criticism of the Ritualistic movement in the German Reformed Church. By J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D. Philadelphia: J. B. Rodgers. 1867. 12mo. pp. 120.

6. Vindication of the Revised Liturgy, Historical and Theological. By the Rev. J. W. Nevin, D.D. Philadelphia: J. B. Rodgers. 1867. 8vo. pp. 93.

7. Reformed, not Ritualistic. A reply to Dr. Nevin's "Vindication," &c. By J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D. Philadelphia: J. B. Rodgers. 1867. 8vo. pp. 156.

8. Liturgical Discussion. Answer to Professor Dorner. By John W. Nevin, D.D., Lancaster, Pa. From the "Mercersburg Review" for October, 1868. Phila.: S. R. Fisher & Co. 1868. 8vo. pp. 115.

confusion, find their centre in the "Order of Worship," published in 1867. A summary of its contents may be useful as a clue to what we would say about it. Its matter is embraced in XXIII Divisions.

I. It commences with the Church Festivals—how to find the time of their occurrence; table of movable festivals from 1867 to 1890.

II. Table of Scripture lessons for all the Sundays in the year.

III. The Regular Service of the Lord's Day. The order of service is as follows: 1. Sentence, said by the minister at the "right of the altar," all standing. 2. Exhortation to Confession. 3. Confession (all kneeling). 4. "Declaration of pardon," minister alone standing. 5. Apostles' Creed, congregation joining in it. 6. Versicle—Minister and people. 7. Gloria in Excelsis, "sung, chanted, or recited." 8. Gospel. 9. Epistle; adding, as the minister may see fit, "other portions of Scripture." 10. Gloria Patri, between the minister and people. 11. Salutation and response. 12. Collect for day. 13. General Prayer or Festival Prayer—in Lent, &c., the Litany. The General Prayer is composed of Collects. 14. Psalm or Hymn. 15. Sermon. 16. Two Collects; Lord's Prayer, in which the people join aloud. 17. Collection and announcements. 18. Psalm or hymn, with doxology. 19. Apostolic Benediction.

IV. The Evening Service is substantially in the same order as the Morning Service.

V. The Litany, which is for the most part after that of the Church of England.

VI. Prayers and Thanksgivings for special occasions.

VII. The Gospels, Epistles and Collects. In addition to the Collect, each Church Festival has two special prayers adapted to it. On Trinity Sunday the Te Deum is to be chanted or recited antiphonally before the sermon. The Gospels and Epistles are printed in full.

VIII. The Preparatory Service to the Holy Communion begins with: 1. A Sentence. 2. The Ten Commandments.

3. Response by the people, "Lord have mercy upon us," &c. 4. Prayer. 5. Litany—all kneeling. 6. Psalm or hymn. 7. Sermon. 8. Exhortation at the altar—occupying four pages. 9. Confession and Declaration of Pardon—nearly two pages. 10. Doxology. 11. Benediction.

IX. The Communion Service itself is as follows: 1. Sentence. 2. Confession. 3. Nicene Creed. 4. Gloria in Excelsis. 5. Gospel and Epistle. 6. Versicles and Prayer. 7. Psalm or hymn. 8. Sermon, "or lesson of moderate length," from the Holy Gospels, on the history of Christ's passion and death. 9. Collection of offerings for the poor, during which Scripture sentences are read. 10. Prayer. 11. Selection of passages from the Holy Scriptures. 12. The Preface paraphrased, and ending with 13, the Sanctus—in which the people join aloud. 14. Words of institution. 15. Prayer, consisting of ten Collects, and closing with the Lord's Prayer. 16. The Pax. 17. The Distribution—"while a sacramental hymn is sung." 18. Prayer. 19. The Te Deum—said or chanted antiphonally. 20. The Benediction. We have then the services of Baptism, Confirmation, Marriage, Ordination and Installation, Excommunication and Restoration, the Visitation and Communion of the Sick, Burial of the Dead, Service to be used at Sea, Reception of Immigrants, Laying of a Corner-Stone, Consecration of a Church, Consecration of a Burial Ground, Order of Scripture Readings for the Family, Prayers for the Family, and, finally, forty-five Canticles, Psalms, and Ancient Hymns.

The mere table of contents of the book testifies to the industry with which it has been prepared. The authors of the book have evidently examined, with great care, the most important liturgies of the entire Christian Church. The material they have accumulated is very rich; and if the German Reformed Church wins for herself the treasure of a true liturgy, the great body of the labor performed in the preparation of this book will not have been passed through in vain.

Its authors have avoided the rock on which the purely Calvinistic liturgies have struck; to wit, that a liturgy was to be composed, not compiled. This book of service is not composed

of the effusions of the rhetoric or theology of the present hour; but in the main is drawn from the great historic sources. Another great excellence in it is that it is thoroughly responsive; the Christian people are restored to the exercise of their precious right to have a direct share in every part of the service. The influence of this Liturgy for good, if it be fairly tried, will be incalculable.

We should not do our part as an honest critic if we did not frankly state in what respects we think the book capable of improvement. First of all, there is a tendency to too great an accumulation of material; the forms are too long; and, in some cases, the didactic element somewhat overcrowds the devotional, and the pith of noble things is concealed by paraphrase. There are, too, some defects in the arrangement. The Creed is in an abnormal position, just before the Gloria. The Gospel, as higher than the Epistle, should follow it in a service which rises as it advances, as every true service does. There are various subjective changes in the Collects, Litany, and other forms which grate upon us; and the general and wise subordination of the services to the usages of the Church of the past, renders the occasional deviations from them, on insufficient ground, so far as we can see, objectionable. It would be a great addition to the devotional force of the Liturgy if the responsive parts were *sung* by the people, instead of being said, and for this there is good Reformed authority.

Neither the merits nor defects of a liturgy can be tested, except by actual use. If the German Reformed Church will take this Liturgy, and thoroughly test it, by a continued use, she will put herself in a position in which she can prove every thing in it; and while its defects will be made more and more apparent, its many unquestionable beauties and excellencies will endear it more and more to the Church; and thus in the final Liturgy of the future she will have all its gold with no alloy.

In connection with the "Order of Worship"—and the movements which culminated in it, there has been and is yet, a controversy in the German Reformed Church, in which it is

not only the right but the duty of every Christian thinker in our land to feel a deep interest. For the importance of a battle is to be determined neither by the size of the field on which it is fought, nor by the number of combatants it brings out, but by the greatness of the principles it involves, and of the issues it settles. The liturgical struggle in the German Reformed Church is one in which all Protestantism is interested; for it is not a mere battle between two parties, but a struggle between two principles; and it is carried on with an ability which gives promise that the result will be felt, beyond the bounds of the communion in which it originates. Neither side of the question has been more ably argued, at a recent date, than by the two gentlemen, Drs. Nevin and Bomberger, who by common consent, are accepted as pre-eminently representative men in the two tendencies. The issue is not at all (upon the surface, at least), between Liturgy and no Liturgy. Both sides profess, alike, to be liturgical. The real question, therefore is, granting that a Liturgy ought to be, what ought it to be, especially in the German Reformed Church?

The whole characteristic movement of Dr. Nevin and his co-laborers has been toward placing the German Reformed Church of this country on a broader basis of Catholicity, as to its doctrine and life, in both of which, at the time of the Mercersburg reaction, it had, as Dr. Bomberger freely admits, greatly departed from its standards and landmarks. Too comprehensive, independent, and vigorous as a thinker, too deeply read in the history of the Church, and too large-hearted himself to sympathize with the sectarian tendency which is the special weakness of the Reformed type of Protestantism, Dr. Nevin has nobly labored to lift into his own loftier sphere the denomination with which he cast in his lot. His labors have not been in vain. To observers, outside of the German Reformed Church, he and his school seem to have saved it. He has in conjunction with a number of men who have wrought in great general unity of spirit with him, breathed into the German Reformed Church a new life; he has created a theological school, he has infused an ardor of investigation into the noblest young minds in the min-

istry of his Church. Dr. Bomberger himself says: "He has long been regarded as an almost unerring oracle. We have been accustomed to pay well nigh unquestioning deference to his opinions." Those who are most remote from concurrence with Dr. Nevin's views acknowledge him to be the very soul of candor and integrity. It is sometimes made a complaint, by Dr. Nevin's readers, that he is not always easy to follow. This difficulty is, for the most part, the result of the recondite nature of his themes, of his depth of thought, and of that thorough mastery of the modern German philosophy in which probably no native-born American is his equal, which makes him move with such ease to himself in it that he is hardly conscious of the requirements of those who have not had his training. His ardor of thought, and his absorption in his discussion, occasionally produce a relative negligence of style; and from our Lutheran point of view he seems to us, sometimes, to run into a perplexity which is the inevitable result of the Calvinistic groundwork on which, in some part, he still rests. He is a writer of a high order, rich in matter, and skillful in form, with almost every kind of excellence at his command. He knows how to grapple with falsehood, with the inflexible hand of logic; can meet folly with that playful rebuke which it dreads more than the severest reproof, and can overwhelm malevolent assumption and falsehood with the raciest wit and keenest sarcasm. Though he has, for the most part, addressed theological thinkers, he has yet shown the power of reaching the hearts of the people. His "Liturgical Question" is an admirable plea for a true Liturgy, to the people as well as to the clergy. It is a genuine *Concio ad populum* as well as a *Concio ad clerum.*

It is no easy matter to find an opponent able to cope with such a writer as Dr. Nevin, but we think the friends of Dr. Bomberger cannot deny that he has done the best the case allowed, for his cause and for them. Highly esteemed as a Christian gentleman, and a faithful pastor, not unknown in the literary world, as the editor of a translation of an abridgment of part of Herzog's Cyclopedia and of Kurtz's Church History, promi-

nent in the councils of his Church, and as a member of the Liturgical Committee, Dr. Bomberger has been looked to with confidence, as a standard-bearer, by the opponents of the tendency represented by Dr. N. Dr. B. has justified this confidence by his great activity and industry as a controversialist. He has shown untiring purpose and skill in putting his points; he has been careful in guarding his own positions, eagle-eyed in seeing the weak points of the other side, and unsparing in the exposure of them. His style is clear and easy, popular, even in its leading defect, which is that of a certain pulpit diffuseness, and if his army be beaten it will have no right to complain that its misfortunes are the result of bad generalship.

As it is agreed, on both sides, that a Liturgy is desirable, as Dr. B., himself, for years earnestly advocated the preparation of one,* the question may be asked, on what do the two parties divide? We reply, in general, that a large part of the question may be said to be one between the Altar and the Pulpit. These Apostles, or rather their friends, have fallen out by the way, disputing which shall be the greater. Romanism degrades the pulpit, to exalt the altar; Puritanism (which is the extravagance of Calvinism) ignores the altar, to magnify the pulpit. Lutheranism gives to both their due and co-ordinate place, not as rivals, but as brethren and servants of the Lord and of His people. Dr. Bomberger's position is that of a *reserved*, not an unqualified Puritanism, and is like all half-way positions, internally self-contradictory; while Dr. Nevin's view is composite, largely Lutheran, with two polar tendencies so nearly of like force as practically to balance and neutralize each other—the one Romanistic (not Romish), the other Calvinistic, in Calvin's own personal sense. His liturgy, and his views of liturgies, are *eclectic*, and that is part of their strength, and, in our judgment, no inconsiderable part of their weakness. The altar, to be truly such, must be associated with faith in the peculiar presence of the Lord; there must be a sacrament of the altar, to give a centre to the offering of praise and prayer. "The

* Revised Liturgy, 65.

last ground," says Dr. N.,* "of all true Christian worship, is the mystical presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist—all the parts of public worship are inwardly bound together by their having a common relation to the idea of a Christian altar." On this point, Dr. N's. remarks are peculiarly fine, and their force is diminished only by what we regard as inadequate views of that mystical presence itself. On this conception of the altar, the new Liturgy of the German Reformed Church is built, upon an apprehension, not entirely logical in its mode, but nevertheless real and vivid that there is a sacramental reality, a supernatural communion, in which Christ gives to us, in some sense and way, not of the world, His broken body and shed blood. On this point, Dr. B. charges the Revised Liturgy with presenting "at least a modified ubiquitarianism."†

Another question is, how is the ministry to be regarded? Does it embody and represent the universal priesthood of believers? Is there any real sense in which a minister is a priest, in which every believer is not?

Another question is, whether the church year is to be maintained in its integrity. Another, whether there is to be an active participation by the people, in attitude and by responses.

On all these points the views contended for by Dr. Nevin, and opposed by Dr. Bomberger, are relatively in affinity with those of the Lutheran Church. Dr. Nevin's argument upon the main points touching them is simply irresistible and unanswerable. In saying that all Dr. B's. efforts to overthrow Dr. N's. points, simply on the general merits of the question are an utter failure, we mean no disparagement of his skill or ability. If he and his antagonist could change sides, we think that however masterly Dr. N's. defence of an untenable position might be, he would be compelled to abandon it. If the church is to have a Liturgy at all, Dr. N. is undoubtedly right in his general position as to what that Liturgy should be.

But with the question, what is the best sort of Liturgy? arises another—whether the best sort of Liturgy, as Dr. N.

* Liturgical Question, p. 23.

† Revised Liturgy, p. 105.

justly regards it, is such as the German Reformed Church of the past has had. On this point Drs. N. and B. do not radically differ. Dr. N. does not deny that the friends of the new Liturgy "propose to themselves something more than the reproduction, simply, of any older Liturgy of the Reformed Church, something more than a mere compilation of offices and forms, modeled on the plan of these liturgies generally."* Dr. Nevin makes admissions which he must have been sure would be used against him. Indeed, his mistake is likely to be, that in the desire of a large nature to be free from everything like unfairness to the other side, he may unconsciously fall into unfairness to his own. "The provisional liturgy is not after the pattern, strictly, of any system of worship which has prevailed, hitherto, in any German Reformed Church, either in this country or in Europe. It makes no such profession or pretence. It aims to be an improvement upon this whole past cultus. All this it bears upon its face, without any sort of concealment or disguise." When Dr. Bomberger quotes, as he does, these concessions, he aids in fixing in his readers' mind a feeling of admiration for the direct, frank, and manly spirit of his opponent, and in making them feel that Dr. N.'s mistake is most likely to be that of a large nature which, in its desire to be free from everything like unfairness to the side he opposes may unconsciously fall into unfairness to his own.

IS THE REVISED LITURGY CONSISTENT WITH THE HISTORY OF THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH?

That no man is opposed to history, unless he is persuaded that history is opposed to him, is as true as the renowned apothegm of Lord Bacon, which suggests it. Even a bulrush cannot grow up without mire, and it must have a root to draw life from the mire. Theories must be fragile indeed, which find nothing in the past to fix and feed them. Both Drs. Bomberger and Nevin feel this—both are anxious to have history with them, and to history both make their appeal. But they

* Liturgical Question, p. 39.

do not both appeal to the same history. Dr. N. urges the history of the Christian or Catholic Church; Dr. B. relies upon the history of the German Reformed Church. Dr. B. does not seem to find much to comfort him in the history of the Church at large, and Dr. N., in effect, gives up the liturgical antecedents of the German Reformed Church, and argues the question upon the broader and truer grounds of Christian liberty, wisely urging that times and circumstances change, and that we should change with them; that experience ripens, and we should ripen with it. Dr. Nevin is really pleading for the liberty of the Church, for her sacred right to change pro re nata whatever is human in her ordinances or modes, to add, abridge or alter, according to her needs in every age and in every land, whatever has been left free to her by the letter or Spirit of God's Word. Dr. B. on the contrary, in the name of freedom, argues with all his might for prescription, so far, at least, as it is on his side; for tradition, whenever tradition is with him. Curiously enough, while Dr. Nevin argues for some of the forms of the Ancient Church, which passed over from it into the Roman Church, he does it on the genuine principles of Protestant liberty, while Dr. Bomberger argues against the forms of Rome, on some of the principles on which Rome argues for them, and becomes one of the greatest sticklers for tradition.

"We contended," he says, "that the Liturgy should be in predominant harmony with the *traditional* usages of the German Reformed Church."* "The great aim was to work out the *traditional* spirit of the German Reformed Church,"† and he represents the bad work of his opponent as an attempt "to revolutionize her most *ancient ecclesiastical usages*."‡ So far then, as Dr. N. has in general, the hankering for "tradition," and "ancient usages," which is imputed to him, Dr. B. abundantly justifies him, as to the principle, and differs only as to what Church should furnish the traditions and usages—the one Dr. taking the ancient and modern Church Catholic as well as the German Reformed Church, surveying and drawing from the

---

* Revised Liturgy, p. 67. † *Ib.*, 70. ‡ *Ib.*, 70.

whole field of liturgics; the other narrowing himself very much to a small segment of the secondary form of Protestantism. Dr. Nevin's position is that of a large Protestant Catholicity. The position of Dr. B. is one which arrays him alike against the Church of the past, and the larger part of the Reformation—it has the narrowness of Puritan principle, without its consistency of application. He grants the value of tradition, yet insists that a part is greater than the whole, that the Palatinate is more than Christendom, and that one year in one century is worth more than the life of the Church through all ages. His whole conception of argument rests at last upon the supposition that the German Reformed Church is no part of the Church Catholic, but is an autochthenic sect, finished in a solitary spasm, with nothing to draw from the past, and nothing to improve upon in the future.

The real question between Dr. B. and Dr. N., as loyal clergymen of the German Reformed Church, is not whether the fundamental principles and history of their Church *demand* such a liturgy as is now in dispute. Dr. N. admits that they do not. The real question is, whether they *allow* of such a liturgy. Dr. B. asserts that they do not. This is one of the points he urges with most vehemence, and it is just here that the ingenuousness of Dr. N's. nature seems to us relatively to weaken his argument. He concedes too much. He really in our judgment has much more foothold in the history of the Reformed Church, as the illustrator of his principles than he is disposed to claim. Both sides seem to us to have lost sight of one great source of evidence as to the worship of the Reformed Church. There is one essential difference between the German Agenda whether Lutheran or Reformed and the Episcopal Book of Common Prayer, which accounts for this oversight. It is this, that while in the Book of Common Prayer, everything is put down both for minister and people; in the German Agenda, Lutheran as well as Reformed, the Liturgy often has very little but what is meant for the minister, while the part assigned to the people is to be looked for in their hymn books. If the old German Reformed Hymn Books be examined, we think that

they will present some facts which will greatly strengthen the historical aspects of the argument for the Revised Liturgy as a genuine German Reformed book of worship.

We are not going to any of the learned sources for an illustration of this. These have been examined on both sides, very thoroughly, and as we think we shall show, too exclusively. We have in our hands a moderately old German Reformed Hymn Book, one of the many actually used in the Valley of Virginia, in worship, in 1792. This book both before and after that date, was in very wide, in fact, in nearly or quite universal use in the German Reformed Church in this country. We have met with it everywhere, and it was reprinted by Sauer,* without change. It is the Marburg and Frankfort Collection of Psalms and Hymns, (1778,) "as they have hitherto been used in the Reformed Churches of Hesse, Hanau, the Palatinate† and many other neighboring lands, with the Heidelberg Catechism," and a full liturgy.

1. And, first of all, the very existence of this book, of SEVEN HUNDRED HYMNS, most of them drawn from the Ancient Church and the Lutheran Hymn writers, this book in nearly universal use in the German Reformed Church in Europe, the book of the German Reformed Church established in America, is death to the fossil theory of Dr. Bomberger, in regard to the immutable "tradition" of his Church. For the original usage and tradition of the Palatinate Church was, that nothing *but the Psalms* and *the poetical parts of Scripture* should be sung in public worship. The Palatinate Church Order says expressly: "Touching the singing of the *Psalms*, the apostle Paul exhorts, &c., &c., wherefore it is our will that none other than the German *Psalms* be sung in our churches." "German *Psalms* shall be sung both before and after the sermon:" "if the people be able to sing, a penitential *Psalm* shall be sung." "Before the sermon, a German *Psalm* shall be sung." The first "*tradition*" of the Reformed Church, as

* A copy of Sauer's first edition is in the library of Rev. P. S. Davis, of Chambersburg.

† Sauer's title-page adds: "Pennsylvania."

Dr. Bomberger defines tradition, was *not to sing at all* in public worship; in Zuingle's Service, everything was said—nothing sung. The second tradition was to sing nothing but *Psalms*, or close paraphrases of Scripture poetry; and this is the true original Palatinate tradition. The third tradition as the whole German Reformed Church of Europe, and her daughter, the infant and mature Reformed Church in America held it, is that *hymns* from uninspired hands may be sung in the worship of God. Nothing in the "order of service," as radically departs from the first and second Reformed tradition, as does this. Yet the traditionary party in the Reformed Church sing from a collection of more than five hundred uninspired hymns—and Dr. Bomberger has issued a collection of between three and four hundred hymns of the same kind for Sunday Schools.* The revisions of the Palatinate Liturgy itself testify against the principle of fossilism. For example, the revised Palatinate Liturgy of 1684, which Dr. Bomberger translated, and published in the Mercersburg Review (January, 1850), says: "German Psalms or *Hymns* shall be sung before or after the sermon;" but in the original the Palatinate order of 1563, and all the earlier editions it is exclusively "German Psalms."† Here was a surrender, out and out, of a liturgical practice and principle, in which the German Reformed Church coincides at first with all the Calvinistic Churches. The French Calvinistic books, which were the great continental model, originally and for a long time embraced nothing but Marot's and Beza's Psalms, with the Ten Commandments, and song of Simeon, also in rhyme, though they ultimately also took in hymns in large numbers.

2. This book has the Psalms rendered very closely, not with interpolations, changes of meaning and subjective adaptations, like those of Dr. Watts, but rigorously as to the sense. It is the version of Lobwasser, the Rous of the German Church. He was a Lutheran, but the rigid literalness of his renderings prevented their use in the Lutheran Church. The desire of

---

* Prayers and Hymns for Sunday Schools. Phila.: 1867. 18mo. pp. 286.

† Richter. K. O. II. 257.

the Reformed Church evidently was to have the Psalms as nearly like the original as was consistent with their being sung by the people. Now, when the Revised Liturgy sets forth Psalms unrhymed to be sung, does it not conform more closely to the German Reformed model, than do those who sing mere adaptations like the current ones, which are used freely by its opponents? To sing medications like those of Watts' and his school, as the very Psalms of David, would have been an abomination to the original Reformed Churches. Yet the Books both in English and German, used unchallenged by the whole German Reformed Church in this country, set forth this very class of Psalm renderings. Here, at least, the Revised Liturgy approximates more nearly than its opponents, to the old view and usage of the Reformed Churches.

We speak advisedly when we say, that to the whole original Reformed Church, and especially to the Palatinate fathers, a large proportion of what is sung as "Psalms" in the English congregations of the German Reformed Church, would have been intolerable, on the ground that pretending to be the Psalms of David they were really the Psalms of Dr. Watts, and of the other authors of the Sacred Parodies. When the German Reformed Church came to use such imitations of the Psalms, she never put them among the Psalms, but where they belong, among Hymns—human effusions suggested by divine originals. The other course is a complete confounding of the unequivocally apocryphal with the canonical, and the effect has been very mischievous. Dr. Watts' Psalms have virtually had the authority of inspiration with those who sing them.

3. There is a table, by which every one of these Psalms is adapted to a day of the Church year; in other words, we have in effect a system of Psalm INTROITS for the entire year, not simply for the chief festivals: and not only are the names of the Sundays derived from the ancient INTROITS—such as Jubilate and Cantate retained, but the Psalms from which the titles are taken are assigned for those days, in all which the spirit of the Revised Liturgy is sustained over against its opponents.

4. The first hymn for opening worship in the Veni Sancte Spiritus reple (Komm Heiliger Geist). It is unrhymed, a chant, to be sung by the people, one of the ancient hymns in use in the Romish Church, and sung in the opening of the Mass in some of the old "Liturgies."*

5. The *adjutorium:* "Our help is in the name of the Lord," taken from the Romish Mass, is used at the beginning of various services.

6. In the Exhortation to Confession before Communion, the minister says: "Wherefore *say* with me: I, a poor sinner," &c.

7. The "Kyrie Eleison" is used. Hymn 209 is the Ten Commandments, at the end of each one of which the people sung untranslated the Kyrie Eleison. They sung it in the same way, without change, both at the beginning and end of the Litany (H. 481).

8. The form of Absolution is of the strongest kind, not one whit surpassed by phrases in the Revised Liturgy, to which most exception has been made.

9. The people are charged to say Amen, in token of their desire to have an interest in the work of Christ: "Wherefore let each one who desires this from his heart, *say* Amen." (Sprech ein jede, Amen).

10. The GLORIA IN EXCELSIS (Allein Gott in der hoh sey Ehr) is given, one of those glorious hymns, which passed from the Greek Church into the Romish, at that period of which the opponents of the Revised Liturgy seem to think so poorly.

11. A table of EVERY DAY of the CHURCH YEAR is given (fifty-five days in all), with the proper Psalms for each indicated. In the first edition of the Palatinate order, only the chief festivals were specified, but as early at least as the edition of 1585, the use of the Gospels for the Sundays of the whole year was authorized.†

* See Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, according to the use of Sarum, Bangor, York, &c. By Rev. W. Maskell, M. A. 2d Edit. London: Pickering. 1846. In some of these Liturgies the Veni Sancte Creator Spiritus was sung. A translation of the Veni Sancte Spiritus, Reple, is given in the "Jubilee Service." Hymn I.

† Daniel; Codex Liturgic. III. 66, n. 2.

12. The old arrangement of the GRADUAL PSALM, after the Epistle, is made easy by having all the Psalms set to music.

13. The HALLELUIA is provided for a number of the Hymns.

14. The old VERSICLE, "Da Pacem" (verleih uns Frieden), for the *Collect* for Peace is given, and then follows the *Collect* for *Peace*, in *prose*, to be chanted by the people, after the service.

15. For the close of the service is provided a translation of the sequence of Gregory the Great: "Grates nunc omnes." It is in prose, and to be chanted.

The Hymns follow the order of the CHIEF FESTIVALS, and afterwards of Subjects.

16. The Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds are all given in the *Agenda*, and the putting of them *there* implies that they are to be used in worship.

17. The NICENE CREED, in its metrical form: "Wir glauben all an Einen Gott," is given to be sung by the people.

18. The APOSTLES' CREED is provided for the oral use of the people.

a. In the Baptismal Service, the minister, before the Creed, says: "*Confess also with me.*" Now there may be silent faith, but *joint confession* must be audible. "With the mouth confession is made."

b. Before the Lord's Supper, the minister, before the Apostles' Creed, says: "Which we confess with *mouth* and heart, saying."

c. In the Hymn-Book, the APOSTLES' CREED (220), *not in metre, but in prose*, is provided for the people—to be sung by them. It is worthy of note, that while in the Agenda, the text of the article on the Church runs: "Eine heilige allgemeine Christliche Kirche," in the Hymn-Book Luther's rendering is retained without change: "Eine heilige Christliche Kirche."

19. But, perhaps, most interesting of all as cutting up by the roots one of Dr. B's. most persistent assumptions, is the LITANY. As to the mode of the service, Dr. B. is most of all

set against its *responsive* character. "A responsive order of service," "forms extremely responsive," "Extremely responsive order," "multiplied responses,"* "excess of responses," excite his most earnest antipathy, and he pleads for "non-responsive forms,"† "reducing the number of responses." But here, in the heart of this book, brought by German Reformed Christians to this new world to be used in the worship of God, we have a prayer which may be said to be all responses, the most responsive of prayers. It is arranged after Luther, so that the minister, choir, or part of the people make fifty-nine invocations or prayers, and the congregations at large make *forty-four responses.* There was nothing to prevent a German Reformed minister from having, at every service, this Prayer with forty-four, or for the matter of that, as antiphonal parts, *one hundred and three responses.* Compared with these, what are the "eighteen responses," of the morning service, the seventeen of the evening service, at which Dr. B. murmurs? And then these prayers were sung, and that singing was chanting, and even the Greek words, which attest that it comes from the "Ancient Church," were retained. If our German Reformed friends will only sing the responses, instead of saying them, they will have their own history as well as the General history of the Church with them.

18. The German SANCTUS is also given. (172).

19. Dr. B. is willing that the "congregation should be *allowed* to unite aloud in the Lord's Prayer." In this old book, the minister calls on them to do it as a duty: "Let us invoke, and *say* thus: Our Father."

20. The German AGNUS DEI is also given, (O Lamm Gottes unschuldig) another hymn of the ancient church, and is in prose as part of the litany.

21. This mute old witness of the Lutheranizing conservatism of the German Reformed Church in Liturgics over against the Puritan extreme of Ultra Protestantism, gives us (we are afraid

---

* Revised Liturgy, pp. 21, 42, 59, 60, 65, 78, 75.

† Do., pp. 68, 71.

we are going to shock our friend, Dr. B. greatly now,) the MAGNIFICAT, the song of the blessed Virgin, which even the Protestant Episcopal Church has marred its service, by omitting, probably out of deference to the Anti-Romish feeling. But this is not the worst. It gives three different renderings of it—the second one closing with the GLORIA PATRI.

22. But the old book is not done yet with the ancient church and its responsive tendencies. It gives us the "Te Deum Laudamus," and this in the German arrangement, is divided into two great responsive portions—twenty-five for each part of the congregation separately, and two parts for them conjointly, fifty-two responses in all. Now if in those primeval days of German Reformed irresponsive apostolic simplicity, for whose return Dr. B. sighs, the minister had used the Te Deum, as well as the Litany, there would have been one hundred and fifty-five responses in these two parts of the service alone, and certainly our Reformed friends may, without disturbing the ashes of their fathers, or doing dishonor to their memory, have a good liturgy, and respond in it to their heart's content.

What a testimony then have we here, in this old hymn book of the fathers—that the German Reformed Church used her Christian Liberty, that she ripened in worship, that she did not fetter herself by the mechanical traditions of a single period in her history—that she availed herself more and more of the treasures of devotion in the Church Catholic, in the Western Church, and in the Lutheran Church—that she gave her people an increasing, direct share in the public worship of God. Certainly the "Order of Worship" is in the full line of development as revealed in the Hymn Book and Agenda of the Reformed Church which was planted in this country—and Dr. Bomberger's views have no support in the traditionary life of the Reformed Church, considered as a whole. There is a parenthesis of three centuries between his views, and the point of union they propose to make, and if these three centuries could be ignored, the radical traditionary party would after all be found more fatally at issue with the Palatinate usage and principle, than the conservative progressive party.

Let us to have clearly before us what was *possible* in the service of the early German Reformed Church, in this country, and in common with its mother in Europe, suppose a pastor imbued with the knowledge and spirit of public worship, with this old book in his hand, and the worship might, without the violation of any rubric, have proceeded thus:

1. The congregation gathers, and seated with bowed head engages in silent prayer. The silence is broken by the people chanting the "Veni Sancti Spiritus, Reple. (H. 2,) closing with the Alleluia.

2. The Minister uses the *Adjutorium*—Confession of sins is made and followed by the ABSOLUTION.

3. The INTROITAL PSALM for the day is sung, closing with the GLORIA PATRI.

4. Then follows the EPISTLE for the day.

5. After which is sung the GLORIA IN EXCELSIS (H. 25): or the TE DEUM (responsively): (at night the MAGNIFICAT, H. 72, 73, 74.)

6. THE GOSPEL for the day.

7. The NICENE CREED; metrical: (H. 219) or the Apostles' Creed, in prose, (H. 220) sung by the people.

8. The Sermon.

9. The Hymn-Psalm. "Create in me a clean heart." (Ps. 51), sung by the people. Or "Grates nunc omnes" (H. 9), chanted.

10. The Litany (responsive) as a General Prayer, with the Lord's Prayer said by all.

11. The Doxology.

12. The Versicle and COLLECT for Peace, sung by the people.

13. The Benediction.

If there were a Communion, there might be used at the proper place; the SANCTUS (H. 172), and AGNUS DEI (H. 106). The NUNC DIMITTIS, metrical (H. 68,) might be sung in closing.

The chant—the response—the audible union in prayer, the singing of the Creed, the living participation of the people throughout, certainly are not only possible, but are invited by

the book of Worship, bearing which in their hands, the Pilgrim fathers of the Reformed Church came to this land.

To a number of these facts, when they were presented a few years ago by the writer, an effort at reply was made. The reply may be analyzed thus: It consisted:

1. Of a repetition of the facts urged. We made an assertion in our own words. The reviewer met it by making the same assertion in his own words. We said that the Te Deum and Litany were placed in the German Reformed Hymn Book to be sung by the people—and the answer was, It is so. BUT "they are named as hymns, and indicated to be sung as hymns." Be it so. The Te Deum *is* a hymn, and ought to be indicated to be sung. *Name* the Litany as you please—only sing it. And so name if you will the old Collect for peace (13), and the Apostles' Creed in prose, (220) hymns, and sing them. Only agree on things and we shall soon cease, to quarrel about names. The point we make is that being in the people's hymn book they were meant for the people. The reply simply rivets what we drove in.

2. The second feature of the reply is that the reviewer with one book, attempts to follow if not correct us, in our notice of another and different one. His hymn-book is not the one we quote—but with a different date, different title, different contents, and a different number of hymns. It is apparently an earlier and inferior issue to the one which came into nearly universal use in the German Reformed Churches in this country. The reviewer's book nevertheless sustains our facts—and has nearly as fully as the later and best edition, everything which could be referred to "influences probably of a Lutheran origin." "It is," says the Reviewer, "evidently substantially the same." But the very existence of later revised and improved editions, is a witness against the fossilism of a narrow Liturgical tradition.

3. A good deal of the reply rests upon the assumption that we assert that the service in the old Hymn Book is completely identical in arrangement and elements with that of the Order of Worship. Our argument simply is that it justifies the principle, and to a large extent some of the very details of the "Order of Worship."

The Hymn Book has old forms, which the Order of Worship has not. The Order has forms which the Hymn Book has not. But both have the most important ones in common—and both rest on the same principle, even where they differ in its application to this or that detail.

4. It is urged that when the Agenda uses the word "*say*" it means "*think:*" when it directs that a form shall be used "with *heart and mouth*," it means, "with the heart only," when the minister charges the people "speak therefore thus with me" it means that he is to *say* it and they are to *think* it. But why not apply the canon to the whole rubric when it directs the minister to "say" things? Why not urge that he too can "*say*," in in silence—and the Palatinate Liturgy could be used as a directory for the silent worship of the Quakers? To argue back from the usage which Rationalism has brought into the Church to the meaning of terms at a period when men said just what they meant, simply and straight out, is certainly illogical in any case, but peculiarly so in the case of the Palatinate Liturgy, which so carefully distinguishes between what is to be said merely "*in* the heart"—and what is to be said "*with* the heart *and mouth*."

What was the probable Reformed usage as to audible Confession of Sin is shown in the modifications of the Genevan Liturgy, as contained in the Frankfort Order of 1554, which was one of the chief sources of the German Reformed Order of 1563. Thus it says: "Brethren let each one of you confess his sins, and among you, I saying them before you, follow me in these words."* In the Genevan Liturgy itself the Confession was silent (*mente-de son cœur*), and without an Absolution—but on German ground the Confession becomes audible, the Absolution is spoken. In the Genevan the Confession was before the Sermon, in the Reformed Church it followed the Sermon.

Now, these and some other peculiarities indicate the operation of influences, which ought never to be left out of sight, in the interpretation of the doctrinal formulas and the

* "Frates vestrum unusquisque peccata sua confiteatur, atque apud vostmetipsos me præeuntem sequemini his verbis." In Richter, II. 150.

liturgical literature of the German Reformed Church. The Palatinate Order was introduced among a population who had been Lutheran, with the liturgical forms of that Church familiar and dear to them. These forms were largely retained. We have before us the Palatinate Lutheran Liturgy,* which was superseded by the Reformed. The Reformed Confession is taken from the Lutheran. The Lutheran Rubric directs the minister to say to the people: "Speak thus." (Sprechet also). The Reformed is more explicit: "Speak, therefore, with me thus." Now the Lutheran mode was, and in many Churches still is, for the minister to repeat the words—and the people repeated *after* him. The people of the Palatinate could have understood the words in but one way—and beyond all reasonable doubt *spoke* the familiar Confession in the old way, and at the old place (after the Sermon). We lay it down as a fair principle of grammatico-historical interpretation, that the Palatinate Liturgy, in all disputed cases, is to be interpreted in a Lutheranizing sense—that is, its phrases for the people are to be interpreted, as they must have been interpreted by a population which had been reared in the Lutheran Church, and who had heard, all their lives, these identical phrases in one sense only. The Reviewer, forgetting the fossil theory to which he is committed, directs attention to the fact that while the Palatinate Liturgy has the "Confession and Absolution as a regular and invariable part of the Sunday Service, the late rubric and practice confined it to the Communion Service"—and then with apparently no consciousness of the egregious blunder in his argument involved in this statement, charges it as a defect in the Revised Liturgy, that it conforms, in this point, with the original Palatinate Liturgy. So much for "Tradition," when tradition is against the Reviewer's party, and in favor of the views that he condemns.

5. The Reviewer assumes that he knows certain things, which he states, and of which he imagines the writer to be ignorant—but all which the Reviewer really knows among the

* Kirchenordnung wie es mit der Christlichen Lehre, &c. (The General title is identical with the Reformed order). 1556. (Neuburg: Kilian).

things stated, the writer also knows, and has said nothing in conflict with them. There *are* things *stated* by the Reviewer which the writer does not know—nor the Reviewer either. The Reviewer seems to claim a superior knowledge of the source of the Agenda in the Hymn-Book. Yet after identifying it with that of the Palatinate, he seems to have looked further, and to have felt forced to acknowledge, that "*while* the Liturgy *is* the Palatinate, yet some *few changes* ought perhaps to be noted, not however affecting the present discussion;" that is as Charles Lamb would put it: they are the same—with a difference. The changes, as he notes them, are: First, That the Palatinate *adds* liturgical matter, which the Hymn-Book *omits*.

Second. The Hymn-Book *adds* matter which the Palatinate *omits*.

Third. That the Hymn-book *alters*, in various ways, the matter it retains.

The Reviewer is right in this acknowledgment of changes, and deserves credit for correcting himself; but if he had a faithful reprint of the first Palatinate before him, he would see how much wider than he suspects is the departure silently and constantly made in the Reformed Church, from the authority of the Palatinate Liturgy. In all these deviations of the Hymn-Book, the Reviewer seems to see improvements, that is, he justifies *omissions*, *additions* and *changes* in the Liturgy despite the old Palatinate—he gives up the whole fossil theory in the very act of attempting its defence.

The fact is, Dr. B. and his party, are in their practice utterly quenched by their own theory. Dr. Nevin and the conservative part of his Church with him, have the history of the development of the Reformed Church with them in the *principle* on which rests the right of the Church to set forth a new Liturgy, even if that history does not furnish its details. On the other hand the *history* of the Reformed Church is *against* the fossil *principle*, and either neutral to the *details* of its practice, or opposed to them. That is, the history of the Reformed Church sustains the conservative *principle* over against the fossil, and

though it can be fully claimed for the details of neither, is less in favor of those who have appealed to it, than of those they condemn. The Palatinate fathers of 1563 would find their precise forms in neither part of the German Reformed Church, but they would find the *principle* on which they made changes then, the principle on which a progressive conservatism claims the right to make them now.

When we see all the various parts of the German Reformed Church, abridging, enlarging, and changing their liturgies—when we see that there were local differences, which never marred their unity of faith, when we think of the common foundation of our Protestant liberty, it seems wonderful, that any Protestant should be found who attempts to raise up a prescription, in its essential character more narrow, more Romish, than that of Rome. The true principle of the Reformed Church, in common with all genuine Protestantism, is that expressed by Ursinus:* "The ceremonies, which are ordained by the Church, may be changed by the Church, if there be good cause." If Progressive Conservatives can show that the "good cause" is with them, they can fairly claim that the history of the Church is not against them.

WORSHIP AND USAGES IN THE REFORMED CHURCHES OF THE CONTINENT.

The Church of England, and her American daughter, the Protestant Episcopal Church, are claimed or repudiated as parts of the Calvinistic or Reformed Churches, just as whim or interest suggests. In the great contests of the Church of England with her Puritan opponents, they constantly urged against her that her worship was Romanizing, or Lutheranizing, and wholly different from the worship of the Continental Reformed Church. This charge was taken up and handled with

* On the Catechism. Quest. 103.

special fullness and ability by John Durel (minister, at the time his book was written, of the French Church in the Savoy).* The opportunities which Durel had of knowing the usages of the Reformed Churches on the Continent were very great,† and his statements may, in all essential respects, be received with unqualified confidence. In addition to Durel, we shall use, in this part of our article, the works of Ebrard,‡ Daniel,§ Alt,‖ Richter,¶ Bingham,** and others, which will be cited at their place.

When we come to the historical traces of the usages of the German Reformed and other Reformed Churches of the Continent, from the Reformation up to the middle of the Seventeenth Century, we find very much to which the Revised Liturgy could appeal in vindication of its claim to toleration and fair trial, which are all it asks.

In the Reformed Church of France, on entering the Church they knelt and offered a silent prayer before taking their seats. In Poland and Lithuania they stood during singing and the reading of the Scriptures. *Kneeling* was the usual posture at prayer. The English Puritans made a point of keeping their hats on during the whole service. The Reformed on the Continent for the most part kept their *heads uncovered.* Even at Geneva, where the hat was worn during the sermon, it was removed in the service. In the discipline of the Reformed Churches of France,†† it is enjoined that "every one, without

---

* A view of the Government and Public Worship of God in the Reformed Churches beyond the seas. Wherein is showed their conformity and agreement with the Church of England, as it is established by the act of Uniformity. London, 1662. 4to. pp. xx. 344.—Liturgy of the Church of England asserted. London, 1662. 4to. pp. 38.

† See Sketches of his life, and his "View," p. 4.

‡ Reformirtes Kirchenbuch. Zürich, 1847. 4to. pp. 290.

§ Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiæ Reformatæ, &c. Lipsiæ, 1851. 8vo. pp. 627.

‖ Kirchliche Gottesdienst (1851). Kirchenjahr (1860). Sunday Service according to the Liturgies of the Churches of the Reformation, on the basis of Alt, by C. P. Krauth. 1853. 8vo. pp. 48.

¶ Kirchenordnungen des Sechszehnten Jahrhunderts. Weimar, 1846. 2 vols. 4to.

** Apologia Eccles. Gallicanæ pro Eccles. Anglicana.

†† Chap. 10, Art. 1, quoted in Durel, pp. 33, 34.

exception, do by these outward signs (uncovering the head and bending the knee), testify the humility of their hearts, and of that inward homage which they yield unto God." In Lithuania, Poland, and Bremen, the hats, during sermon, were lifted at the *name of Jesus*, and the women bowed or courtesied; and this usage largely, though not universally, prevailed in the Palatinate. In the French Reformed Church, after singing the Ten Commandments, they *fell upon their knees* and sung the Kyrie (rhymed). The Nunc Dimittis was also sung, *kneeling*, after Communion.

In Hesse, the *Psalms* were sung *antiphonally:* the Præcentor and choristers, with all the people, sung one verse; then, with the accompaniment of the organ, the second was sung very softly by a few voices; the third was then sung as the second, the fourth as the third, and so to the end. In the Church at Bremen, the Psalms were sung by course, in a very elaborate manner.

Though Calvin's Liturgy opens with a form of Confession, which was to be said kneeling, yet the fear of giving offence caused him, against his own judgment and wish, to omit a form of *Absolution* at Geneva; but he says: "We are most earnest in desiring that the people have the *Absolution* pronounced unto them, and to hear it upon their *knees.*"* But, more than this, Calvin approved of *Private Absolution.* "I do not propose to deny how useful Private Absolution is; but, as I have done in many of my writings, *I recommend* the use of it, provided it be free, and pure from superstition." (Second Defence against Westphal. VIII., 678). Many of the Reformed Churches of France, Hesse, and elsewhere, had forms of General Absolution. The Bohemian Confession†

---

* Epistolæ, Genev. Edit. p. 452. Amsterdam Edit. (1667). Ep. de Rit. p. 206.

† Corpus Libr. Symb. qui in Eccles. Reformatorum auctor. publ. obt. (Augusti), 1827. pp. 275—326.

Collectio Confess. in Eccl. Reformat, publ. Edit. H. A. Niemeyer. Lipsiæ. 1840. pp. 771—852.

Samml. Symbol. Bücher welche in der Ev. Reformirter Kirche, &c. (F. A. Beck). 2d Ed. Neustadt, 1845. Vol. ii. 1—167.

says: "They teach that penitents should approach the Priest (sacerdotem), and before him confess to God Himself their sins (though we do not command or exact the enumeration of the particular sins), and should seek from him (the Priest) counsel and instruction how to avoid sin, and should seek from him absolution through the keys of the Church, that they may obtain the remission of sins by the ministry thus instituted by Christ. Men are likewise taught, that they should highly esteem the Absolution, and should believe, that what is promised through the keys, beyond doubt takes place, inasmuch as it is the voice of Christ, set forth in His command: John xx. 23. 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them,' &c., and they should know that by the use and ministry of the keys, and by authority of Christ's words, all their sins are forgiven them." (Art. V). In the Reformed Church of Poland, the Declaration of Thorn, in rejecting Auricular Confession, and all the associated errors of the Church of Rome, thus beautifully describes and recommends Private Absolution: "We hold it to be free, and most useful for anxious consciences, to resort to the counsel of those who by their office come to a more familiar acquaintance with the nature and circumstances of sins, to seek consolation each from his own pastor, by some declaration of the sins by which the anxious mind is tortured; and for this reason also we believe *that it is useful to retain Private Absolution.*" (Augusti Ed. p. 434. Niemeyer's, 683. Beck, II. 162).

The original Reformed Churches were all Liturgical Churches; all had, and used forms of service. This is true even of the least conservative of them, as for example the Church of Scotland. Ultra Puritanism is no part of the Reformation, or of the original Reformed Churches, but a schism from the Reformed Church. Lewis Capellus, a great teacher in the Dutch Reformed Church, calls the Puritans "morose, scrupulous, and too finical, not to say superstitious men, to whom it has seemed good for very trifling reasons, almost of no moment whatever, to abrogate the Liturgy hitherto used in the Church of

England, and to substitute for it what they call their 'Directory.'" While the Liturgies of the Reformed Churches made an opening for free prayer (usually as a preparation for the sermon) to a limited extent, they fixed the main parts of the service; and it was not left to the discretion of ministers or congregations to depart from these. Calvin* says: "I *approve very much* that the form of prayers and rites of the Church be fixed, from which it would not be lawful for the pastors to depart in their function." The Kirk of Scotland, at the beginning of the Reformation, used the Book of Common Prayer.

The Reformed Church of Hesse had the service at the Communion-table, to which they did not hesitate to give the name Altar. The Genevan and many other Reformed services begin with the adjutorium: "Our help is in the name of the Lord."

For a day of humiliation Calvin set forth a form to be used by himself and the other ministers. Calvin, in his Liturgy, enjoins the *bidding prayer*, and himself used it. In the Church of Geneva certain proper Psalms were appointed, not only for *Sundays*, but for particular *hours* of the day.

The Reformed ministers wore the cassock, gown, and surcingle. The pictures of Calvin, and the Reformers of his school, represent them in the gown and cap characteristic of divines. The Reformed ministers of Poland and Lithuania, when they ministered in Lutheran Churches, wore the white surplice. Peter Martyr says: "If there were peace between our Churches and the Saxon (Lutheran) Churches as touching doctrine, there would be no separation whatever about vestments of this kind (the surplice)."†

The Reformed Churches kept the holy days of the Church-Year. The Synod of Dort enjoined the keeping of Christmas, Easter, Whitsunday, and recommended that the Churches which did not keep Circumcision and Ascension should conform to the "use of the other Churches" by observing them. Some

---

* Ep. ad Protect. Anglic.

† C. 24.

of the Reformed Churches observed the days of the blessed Virgin, of the Apostles and Martyrs, and of Saints.*

The Helvetic Confession says: "It is not lawful for any one

---

* The Declaration of Thorn, alluding to the festivals commemorative of our Lord, adds: "We keep as festivals (feriatos agimus) certain days dedicated to the memory of the saints, as, for example, the days of the blessed (beatæ) Virgin Mary, Michael the Archangel, and of the Apostles, to show forth in grateful commemoration in the grace of God imparted to them or through them, and to arouse ourselves to the imitation of their example." (Augusti: 425. Beck, II. 151. Niemeyer: 678). The original views of the Continental Churches in regard to the "Sabbath," and "Lord's Day," were completely in conflict with the Puritan theory, even more so than those of the Lutheran Church. Thus the second Helvetic Confession (1566) says: "The Lord's Day itself was, in the ancient Church, from the Apostles' times, consecrated to sacred rest, which also now rightly is kept by our Churches for worship and love's sake. But we concede nothing herein to Jewish observations and superstitions. For we do not believe one day to be holier than another, nor that rest is, *per se*, pleasing to God, but we observe the Lord's Day, not the Sabbath, with a free observation." (Augusti: 82. Beck, I. 169. Niemeyer, 526). The Genevan Catechism (1541), prepared by Calvin, which divides the palm of rude reception in the Reformed Church with the Heidelberg, says, in explaining the Commandment in regard to the Sabbath: "The observation of rest is part of the old ceremonies, and is therefore abrogated by the coming of Christ. This commandment, so far as it is ceremonial, pertains properly to the Jews only, and is consequently temporary." (Augusti, 493. Beck, I. 249. Niemeyer, 145). The Heidelberg Catechism (Quest. 103) makes the Sabbath law cover "other times, and especially the holy-days" of the Church-Year (besonders am Feierage festis diebus), does not mention the Lord's Day at all, and is thoroughly anti-Puritan in the whole interpretation of the command. Ursinus, in his interpretation of the command, is thoroughly at war with the Puritan theory of the Sabbath. He makes the whole moral and perpetual part of the commandment to be that "*some certain time* be allotted to the ministry of the Church, or to the public service of God," "to allot some time to sermons, prayers, and the administration of the sacraments." "The other part is ceremonial, and temporary, namely, that that time be the seventh day." "The Sabbath of the seventh day was, together with the rest of the ceremonies and types, fulfilled and abrogated by the coming of the Messias." ' The new Sabbath dependeth on the arbitrament or appointment of the Church, which for certain causes maketh choice of the first day, and that first day is to be observed for order's sake, but without any opinion of necessity, as if that and no other were to be observed by the Church." "We are not restrained or tied to have either Saturday or Wednesday, or any other certain day." If the Reformed fathers, with Calvin at their head, could have appeared in the noontide time of Puritanism in New England, with their views of the Sabbath, and their consonant practices, they would have fared little better than the Salem witches; and if they were to appear in some of the Reformed Churches, to whose soul the flattering unction is laid, that they by pre-eminence cleave to the Palatinate principles, and the Heidelberg Catechism, in their original purity, these fathers would fare no better than the Revised Order of worship.

to overthrow this ordinance of the Church in regard to the regulation of public prayer." "We do approve exceedingly of the religious celebration of Christmas, Circumcision, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension, and Whitsunday. This Helvetic Confession was subscribed largely by the Reformed Churches, among them by the Church of Geneva, and, in 1566, by that of Scotland. Fasting days, set days, Fridays, Ember-weeks, Lent, and the Passion-week were observed in Poland, Bohemia, and Lithuania.

In Holland, Germany, Switzerland, Geneva, and elsewhere, the old churches were kept, the images and movable pictures being taken down; but even in Geneva the pictures on the windows of stained glass were not removed. In many cases the crosses on the churches were spared, and on the new-built Reformed Churches, as for instance in Caen, crosses were set up. In some of the Genevan Psalters and Bibles, Faith is represented leaning on the cross. In the French Church (1609), express action was taken, authorizing maimed Reformed soldiers to wear the *cross* upon their cloaks, which was required for the reception of the king's aid. Forms for the dedication of Churches were used. The chancels were left unchanged in most of the Churches, and the fonts of stone retained. Whether a single or trine application should be made of the water in Baptism, was left free. Both were in use in the German Reformed Church.* Zuingle approved and retained the Chrism-cloth in Baptism (Westerhemde). The *rite of Confirmation*, by the laying on of hands, was at first rejected in all the Reformed Churches, and no one of them speaks of it more bitterly than the Palatinate Liturgy. It appoints simply that the children shall be instructed in the Catechism, and that before they are admitted to the Lord's table, they shall be examined in the Catechism before the whole Congregation—and then contrasts with this the work of "Satan through the anti-

* Daniel. Cod. Lit. iii. 127. N. 2.

christ, to wit, the Pope, substituting his smearing and slapping, and other abominations, which he calls Confirmation."* Nevertheless, the rite of Confirmation has been introduced into the German Reformed, the Dutch, and other parts of the Reformed Church—and is not, we believe, objected to even by the sticklers for the Palatinate Liturgy as it was, which knew of no such rite.

At the Cathedral Church of Basle, the stone altar, on which Mass was once said, was retained. In the Cathedral of Berne, and in that of Lausanne, they had altars of black marble, and in the country Churches of that Canton, the common material of the altar was a dark blue stone, and these Churches called their Communion-tables *altars*. Violent as was the opposition on the part of many of the early Zuinglian and Calvinistic Reformers to the very name of altar, as applied to the Communion-table, the name became more and more common among the conservative part of the Reformed Communion, and especially in the German Reformed Church. In the great Churches silver chalices and plates were used at the Communion. The Ten Commandments, Creed, and Lord's Prayer, were sometimes set in large tablets. Originally the opposition to statuary and paintings in the Churches was very strong. "It is contrary to Scripture, that the image of a man should be placed in the Church of Christ." (Helv. Conf. ch. iv). The Heidelberg Catechism teaches that the Second Commandment forbids "the expressing God by any image or figure," and that "paintings and sculpture are not to be tolerated in the Churches." The principles of the Catechism would not allow of even the engravings of the ordinary pictorial Bibles, or other books in which God is pictured Even any kind of sculpture or painting of sacred objects in the Church is, to use the words of Ursinus, "not to be tolerated, but utterly to be abolished, and removed from the sight of man whether they be worshiped or no." The 98th Question, and Ursinus' argument upon it,

* In Richter. II. 260.

is directed distinctively against the Lutheran view. But this early rigorism has yielded everywhere, not only in the conservative part of the Reformed Church, but in Puritanism itself. Even in arguing against images, The Tetrapolitan (ch. xxi.) says: "We also confess that the use of paintings and statuary is of itself free." Calvin, in the Geneva Catechism, is very moderate. "This commandment does not prohibit painting or statuary, but only the making of pictures or images to represent God, or to be worshiped. Wherefore we are not to understand that pictures or sculpture are condemned in these words, but only that we are prohibited from making images, in order that we may seek or worship God in them; or, what is the same thing, that we should worship them to the honor of God, or in any way abuse them to superstition or idolatry." (Augusti, 489. Beck, I. 243. Niemeyer, 141).

In entering the Reformed Churches on the Continent, the men took off their hats, the women of quality their masks, the devout knelt and offered silent prayer before taking their seats. The Puritan "Directory" *forbids the offering of silent prayer on entering the Church.* In the Reformed Churches the head was uncovered during the worship. In Lithuania, Polonia, in Bremen, and by many in the Palatinate, the hats were taken off at the name of Jesus, and the women, if sitting, bowed their heads, if standing, made a courtesy.

In Transylvania and Hungary there was daily morning and evening Common Prayer, with preaching in addition on Wednesdays and Fridays. In Hesse, and in many French Churches, there was daily prayer at noon. Many of the Reformed Liturgies have an order of Morning and Evening Prayer, Forms of Confession of Sins, General Prayer, the Litany, forms for Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the Church Rites. The service generally begins with a Confession of Sin, which opens with the Adjutorium retained from the Romish service. The *Absolution* follows in most. Calvin, as we have seen, laments that he had "yielded too early" against his better

judgment, in omitting a form of Absolution to avoid giving certain persons offence."*

The Reformed Churches, to a large extent, had appointed services, in some cases, for the Church-year, in others for every day. In some, as in Hesse, the minister took his text out of the Gospel. In Lithuania and Poland the three General Creeds were rehearsed in their fit place. The Lord's Prayer was much used. In Calvin's Liturgy, it could be used before the service; a paraphrase of it closes his general prayer; and it occurs in most of the offices. In the French Church in Holland it occurred three times in one service. It was said aloud at meals after grace. Most of the Puritans omitted it from public worship. In Poland and Lithuania the people stood at the rehearsing of the Creeds, and in their Churches, as also in Transylvania and Hungary, and among the Bohemian brethren, the people used always to say the prayers aloud after the minister, as in the Church of England. In this same Church they often sung their prayers, and also their creeds. The Apostles' Creed, *not rhymed, but in prose*, and the Lord's Prayer are placed in the Hymn-Books for singing in the Churches of Hesse, Hanau, and the Palatinate, and in the German Reformed Church, as originally planted in North America. Baxter himself, in his emendation of the Anglican Liturgy, provides for the reading of the three General Creeds.

In the Reformed Church of Poland the Communion was received kneeling; in the Church of France, standing. In Poland, *sitting* at the Communion became a distinctive mark of the Arian Baptists (Ariana Baptistis), and the Reformed Synod of 1578 determined that "the devout should receive this sacrament of the body and blood of Christ standing, or kneeling." Sitting, as practiced by "those treacherous apostates from us to Arianism, who rashly changed all things in the Church, and without knowledge made a quasi imitation of Christ, this sitting, as proper to those who thus treat Christ and His holy things irreverently, we reject as a ceremony less decorous and

* Ep. ad quæst. de quibusdam artibus. Ed. Genev. p. 452.

religious, and to the more simple-minded, in some degree scandalous." (Niemeyer, 572).

The Communion was administered privately to the sick in the Churches of France, the Church of the Netherlanders, in London, the German Reformed Church of the Palatinate, and elsewhere,* and particular directions as to the mode are given in the Liturgies of all the Churches.

In the Palatinate Liturgy provision is made for the exchange of rings in the wedding service.† In spite of the violent dislike which the more radical part of the Reformed Church felt, and still feel toward the *organ*, and which was at first displayed in breaking it to pieces, the German Reformed Church brought it more and more into use (though it is not provided for by the Palatinate Liturgy) until now in all Germany there is hardly a Reformed Church without one.‡ The Reformed Churches of the Continent did not sympathize with the Ultraism of Puritanism in regard to the *Apocryphal Books*, but spoke in the soberer tone of the Church of England. The Second Helvetic Confession says: "We do not desire to conceal the fact, that certain books of the Old Testament (quosdam Vet. Test. libros) were named by the ancients Apocryphal, and by others Ecclesiastical, inasmuch as they wished them to be read in the Churches, not however, to be cited from, or to confirm the faith." (Augusti, 5, Beck; I. 72; Niemeyer, 468.) In the Polish Reformed Church, the Declaration of Thorn says: "Those Books which are not found in the Hebrew Canon of the Old Testament, but only in the Greek Text, are The Apocrypha, and are not to be counted with that divine Canon, (especially under pain of Anathema), though they may be usefully read, to the edification of the Church" (Augusti, 414; Beck, II. 136.) The Dutch Reformed Church, in the Confession of 1579, which the Synod of Dort (1618–1619) solemnly accepted, after enumerating the Apocryphal books, says: "which the Church can read" (this is not the perusal of private reading

---

* Daniel, Cod. Lit. II. 200. N. 1. Niemeyer, Coll. Conf., 572.

† Pfalz, K. O. in Richter. II. 272.

‡ Daniel, iii. 18.

but public reading of the *Church*),* and can draw from their teachings (documenta) concerning things in which they agree with the Canonical Books" (Augusti, 172; Beck I. 298; Niemeyer, 362). All the Reformed translations of the Bible contain the Apocrypha.

The tone of the Continental Reformed Confessions, in regard to the VIRGIN MARY, is strikingly at variance with that of Puritanism. It is generally in correcting the Romish idolatrous abuses of the reverent regard due to the mother of our Lord, that this topic is introduced, and what is said is the more striking because of the temptation to a polemic undervaluing of the Virgin. Thus the Bohemian Confession; "Of the most blessed Virgin Mother of our Lord, elect of God among women before the ages, Virgin before, Virgin after our Lord's birth. She who though no less than others, redeemed by the blood and gracious merit of her Son, was a temple or shrine of the Holy Ghost, by whose great gifts, virtues, and graces she was endowed. For God hath done to her, beyond others, great things, therefore our churches celebrate her festal days to God's glory. They compose pious hymns concerning her, which are sung both at home and in the Church. They, in her, praise God, and exhort all to the imitation of her faith and other virtues, and commemorate her labors for the Lord. For with the whole church of the saints, they proclaim her most blessed." (Augusti 316; Beck, II. 55; Niemeyer, 812.) "Our preachers," says the Tetrapolitan Confession "teach that we are most highly to honor (Summo studio colere) the mother of God (parentem Dei) the most holy (sanctissima) Virgin Mary." (Augusti, 342; Beck, 421; Niemeyer, 753). In the Leipzig Colloquy 1631, the Reformed theologians declared that they incontrovertibly believed that the Virgin Mary, before, in, and after our Lord's birth remained a Virgin, and that she was not merely the mother of a man, nor merely mother of Christ, but truly theotokos or mother of God (Gottesgebärerin). (Augusti, 392; Beck, I. 481.

---

* Ae the Syntagma of 1612 adds: "The Apocryphal books may be read in the Church."

Niemeyer, 657.) The language of the Declaration of Thorn is equally strong: "We acknowledge that she is before all to be celebrated and venerated, inasmuch as she is the mother of God (Deiparem) (Augusti, 415. Beck, 139. Niemeyer, 672.)

The Liturgy of Zwingli* was in general use in Reformed Switzerland. It appeared in 1525, and was not, as is sometimes imagined, the product of an era of his imperfect development with Romish tendencies still clinging to him; but reveals his radical extreme in its strongest forms. The minister is not to wear the surplice; the communicants are to sit; the bread to be carried about in wooden plates; "each one with his own hand is to break off a bit or mouthful;" the cups are to be of wood; *there is no music, no singing in the service from beginning to end.*† The service shows, what in Zwingli's judgment was the furthest remove possible from the Romish ritual. "It is necessary," he says, in the Preface, "that everything not in conformity with God's Word (in the administration of the Supper) be abrogated." Now let us see what in Zwingli's judgment harmonized with the strong position he took. He selects Easter, Whitsunday, and Christmas, as three chief days of Communion. The service begins as the Mass does. "In the name of the Father," &c. The deacons answer in the name of the church, Amen. There is Confession of Sin; unleavened bread is laid on the table; the people kneel during

---

* Zwingli's Werke. Zürich, 1830. Vol. ii. II. Abth. p. 235, and the "Expositio Fidei."

† How relatively songless, and indifferent to song, parts of the Reformed Church long continued, is shown in the Helvetic Confession of 1566: "So also the singing in Church, *where it is in use*, is to be restricted. The Gregorian chant has many absurdities, wherefore it is rightly rejected by ours and many other Churches. If there are Churches which *have no singing*, they ought not to be condemned. For not all churches have the necessary skill (commoditatem) for singing. And it is certain, from the testimonies of antiquity, that singing was introduced at a late period into the Western Churches." (Augusti, 81. Beck, I. 168. Niemeyer, 525). In the spirit of Zwingli, the Tetrapolitan Confession (1530) had contrasted the ancient and the then existing usages of the Romish Church thus: "It was the custom in the *ancient* Church to RECITE *a very few Psalms, now a number of the Psalms are* SUNG." (Augusti, 357. Beck, ii. 440. Niemeyer, 763). How utterly the whole Reformed Church has receded from this radical extreme need not be shown.

the prayer. The Epistle precedes the Gospel. The minister and the congregation, after the Epistle, respond together. The GLORIA IN EXCELSIS is said with a minuteness of responsive division, which cuts it up into fifteen parts. The deacon or reader speaks the salutation; the people reply. The lector announces the Gospel. The people answer: Praise be to God. After the Gospel comes the Apostles' Creed, the ministers beginning, the people, men and women, responding alternately, seventeen parts in all. The exhortation to Communion is followed by the Lord's Prayer; the people kneeling, and sealing it with the Amen, as they do every prayer. After the Communion, the congregation, on bended knees, repeat (the minister beginning it) alternately, men and women, the cxiii. Psalm, eight sentences and responses. The pastor speaks the Thanksgiving; the people answer, Amen; and he closes with the words, Depart in peace.

Such was the original Reformed Liturgy, the most completely responsive Liturgy ever used in the Christian Church, prepared not as a compromise with Rome, but as the most radical mode in which the most radical of the Reformers proposed to set aside and overthrow the ritualism of Rome. Rome gave nothing to the people to do in worship. Zwingli gave them just as much as was possible. In our day Puritanism and Romanism often meet. You enter their churches, to hear the minister's voice at one end, the voices of a choir at the other (singing in Latin in the one, and an unknown tongue in the other), the people between as mute as fishes. Not in the Church of England, nor in the Lutheran Church, but in the Zwinglian Reformed Church originated the idea of a larger number of responses *said* by the people. When the Reformed Church gives up responsive worship, she not only abandons the tradition of the whole ancient Church, under both dispensations, but abandons her own earliest tradition. Claiming to be conservative, as over against even the Zwinglian phase of her development, she reaches a radicalism of which Zwingli never would have dreamed.

The early liturgical views of Zwingli, when he was never-

theless thoroughly in a Protestant position against Romish ritualism, are yet more conservative than what we have quoted, as expressed in his works on the Mass. (Works, vol. III).

At the time of the hottest controversies between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, when the differences were magnified on both sides to the last degree, it was never pretended by either party that there was any diversity in regard to the principles of public worship involved in this discussion. The Reformed and Lutheran Churches were a unit, as to every *principle* of worship which now divides the German Reformed Church. The history of the two Churches demonstrates that it was conceded on both sides, that if there were doctrinal harmony, the questions of public worship would settle themselves. Both Communions hold that the Church of each country has the right, *pro re nata*, to change and order all matters of worship not fixed by God's Word, as her best interests may, in each case, demand.

"When," says the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), "unlike usages are found in the Church, no one should argue from this that the Churches are, on this account, out of unity. We at this day having in our Churches diverse rites in the celebration of the Lord's Supper and in some other things, yet dissent not in doctrine and faith, nor is the unity and fellowship of our Churches sundered thereby. For at all times the Churches have used their liberty in rites of this kind as things really indifferent. Which very thing we also do at this day." (Chap. xxvii. Augusti, 88. Niemeyer, 531. Beck, I. 177). This is but an expansion of the doctrine of the Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession: "It is not necessary to true unity of the Christian Church that like ceremonies instituted by men should everywhere be observed." In consonance with these principles, the Declaration of Thorn, after specifying the Romish abuses in worship, which all Protestants unite in condemning, says: "These abuses, and the like, which it would take long to enumerate, being removed, we believe that what is left may be retained in the Church, nor do we believe that where there is danger of offence there should

be a hasty abrogation of rites and ceremonies received from antiquity, or in daily use, which are neither repugnant to God's word, nor destitute of a probable reason, nor shown by experience to tend more to the Church's corruption than to her edification." (Augusti, 427. Beck, II. 154. Niemeyer, 679). "The rites and ceremonies of each of the Churches (Lutheran and Reformed) we leave free," says the Sendomir Consensus (1570), "for it matters not much what rites are observed, if the doctrine itself, and the foundation of our faith and salvation remain uncorrupted." (Niemeyer, 559).

And when we come to look at the controversies between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, which were connected with the application, in detail, of the principles of Christian liberty asserted equally on both sides; when the difference was widest and the discussions most violent, we find no objection made on the part of the Reformed Church to any one of the features of Lutheran worship, in which the new order of worship coincides with it.

The following are the points touching ceremonies, in which any part of the Continental Reformed Churches differed from the Lutheran:

I. Some parts of the Lutheran Church, (the Palatinate was not one of them) had a brief form of exorcism; maintaining that if the rite were divested of all false doctrine and superstition, it was free and indifferent; the Reformed Churches would not tolerate exorcism in any shape, or with any explanation whatever.

II. In case of absolute necessity the Lutheran Church allowed of lay baptism, and if none but a woman could be had, allowed her to baptize. Alting does not argue against *lay* baptism, but denies that *women* are ever to be allowed to baptize.

III. The Lutheran Church held that the "*breaking*" of the bread at the time of the Supper, is not an essential part of the Sacrament. The German Reformed Church held that it is a necessary ceremony, and in no case can be omitted.

IV. In the Lutheran Church the communion could be administered to a sick person, though no one partook with him.

The German Reformed Church held it to be necessary that "the preaching of the word should precede the communion, and that several persons should partake with the sick man."

V. The Lutheran Church held that it was lawful to use bread in the form of *wafers*. The German Reformed Church thought that ordinary bread should be used in the Supper.

VI. The Lutheran Church used an altar in administering the Communion, retaining the high altar that had been used in the Roman Catholic Church. The German Reformed Church, maintained that there should be but a table; "that the altar of idols should be demolished." "The altars of the Lutherans are altars of idols—for they are reliques of Popery."

VII. The Lutheran Church used *chalices* of the precious metals. The German Reformed Church used the ordinary drinking cup, maintaining that "the chalice should be put away and other cups substituted."

VIII. In most of the Lutheran Churches the *surplice* was retained. The German Reformed Church maintained that the surplice "was not to be tolerated." "The *white* color is proper to the mass." In both Churches the black gown was worn.

IX. In the Lutheran Church the bread was generally placed in the *lips* of the communicant. The German Reformed Church pronounced that mode "superstitious."

X. Though the Churches did not differ in the main principle involved in Private Absolution, it was far more highly esteemed and much more practiced in the Lutheran than in the Reformed Church.

XI. The bowing of the knee, and the uncovering of the head at the name of Jesus, was approved and practiced in the Lutheran Church; it was disapproved of by many in the German Reformed Church.

XII. In parts of the Lutheran Church some of the Latin hymns were retained in public worship: the German Reformed Church would allow of no such use of them.

XIII. The Lutheran Churches had in them, statues and pictures representing sacred subjects. The German Reformed Churches would have neither.

XIV. The Lutheran Church had instruments of music, especially the organ: the German Reformed Church rejected all instrumental music in worship, and pronounced of the organs especially that as devices of Romish superstition "They ought to be hated by us, and have rightly been cast out of our houses of worship."

These were the points of diversity as stated by Henry Alting* distinguished as a theologian of the Heidelberg Catechism in the Palatinate, and afterwards in Holland, in the first half of the Seventeenth Century. Shall either of the Churches, where time has been working its quiet changes, go back merely for tradition's sake, to the old forms and revive, without reason, the dead, old disputes? Shall we have exorcism, and the Latin hymns back again in the Lutheran Church—because she once had them,—and shall the German Reformed Church melt down her silver communion cups, and burn up her organs, because she once disapproved of them? Shall we not rather thank God as any real healing is seen in any part of His bleeding Church, and especially if, not by compromise of principles, but by genuine growth in them, the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, with so many ties to each other, and with so great a work in common, are able at any point to approach each other.

The facts as here presented demonstrate: That though the Reformed Churches on the continent, were relatively to the Lutheran Church, less liturgical they were relatively to Puritanism, decidedly liturgical. They show that no part of the Reformed Church has stood by a fossil tradition in worship but that great changes have occurred in all parts of it: that there is no part of the Reformed Church now which is conformed throughout to the orders of worship of the Sixteenth Century. They show that all the changes have been in one great general direction, that of less rigor and baldness with increasing popularity, warmth and variety. The chasm of modes of worship between the Reformed Church and the more ancient

* In his Exegesis Augustanæ Confess, and Syllabus Controvers., quæ Reformatis hodië intercedunt cum Lutheranis. Edited by his son, 1647.

parts of Western Christendom has constantly been narrowing. The best Reformed worship of to-day is more churchly, more Catholic, more nobly, genially, and truly Christian than that of the Palatinate in 1563. The most earnest Christians of that unhappy time required all the grace they could command to keep from cutting each other's throats. It was no time for the production of a new, well-ordered service. It was a dogmatic, polemic and symbolic, not a Liturgic period. For gentler and riper times, the great work of producing a true Liturgy has been reserved—and when the work which has been done for the Reformed Church in the "Order of Worship," is finished, we believe that that Order taking its final shape will receive the approval of all good men, as one of the most unmistakable and admirable outgrowths of the larger experience, the broader principles, the truer internal harmony and self-consistency to which the Reformed Church has attained in her three centuries of development.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE; *the Reform Against Nature. By Horace Bushnell. New York; Charles Scribner and Company*, 1869.

This neat little book of 184 pages has lain upon our desk for some time. We read it with interest when it first appeared, and found it fresh and instructive as all Dr. Bushnell's writings are. The author is a clear, vigorous, and deep thinker. In coming to a subject which has come to attract so much public attention, we would expect him to speak words of wisdom. At his age, too, we would expect him to be comparatively free from anything like partizan zeal, and therefore able to see the truth on both sides of a controversy such as that in regard to the place and sphere of woman in society. He acknowledges in setting out that he has changed his views on some points that relate to this subject. For instance, in regard to the education of the two sexes, when he first heard of their being educated together, he confesses, with some mortification, he was shocked even by the rumor of it, but his maturer judgment has led him to believe, that it is the natural, normal way, and that it is attended with good results to both sexes.

In our view, the whole matter of education with us here in America is fast tending to wreck and failure, from the primary schools up to the colleges and seminaries. These are in the main, like many other American doings at first, wild and chaotic, shallow and neglectful in their work, and to a large extent based upon infidel principles. We look for the whole structure to come tumbling down one of these days, and then in the reorganization the time will be more propitious to learn what needs to be done to make the work what it ought to be.

In going on from this point, the author thinks that there are many other pursuits in which woman may be properly associated with man. In the work of educating, in certain departments of the practice of medicine, of law, and even in certain *ministrations* in the Church, she could labor with man, whereas in *administration* she is required to yield the place to man. This leads to the discussion of the question of Women's Suffrage, the subject of the book. The discussion is carried through seven chapters:—I. No right of suffrage absolute in man or woman, II. Woman not created or called to govern, III. Scripture doctrine coincides, IV. Subtle mistakes of feeling and argument, V. The report of history, VI. Probable effects, VII. Prospects and possibilities of woman. Such are the topics discussed. It is needless to say they are ably treated.

Yet while we award all due merit to the discussion, we fail to find *fully* brought out the great problem of the difference of sex. This was ably treated, we remember, some time ago, by another of our country's great thinkers, Dr. Tayler Lewis, in a religious periodical.

In seeking to find the points of equality between man and woman, the points of difference are too much left out of view; of course, as soon as we name *sister*, *wife*. *mother*, all feel at once the sacredness of the difference. Those names point out corresponding vocations. But the tendency in our times is to lose sight of the character of woman as *woman*. The distinction is obliterated in the genus *man*, and the deep *moral* significance of sex especially is not considered. Sisterhood, wifehood, motherhood, if we may use these words, are gathered up in what is more than any and each—WOMANHOOD. This it is that needs especially to be sacredly regarded in considering the sphere of the sexes.

3 1198 04015 1420
N/1198/04015/1420X

UNIVERSITY
of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

3 1198 04015 1420
N/1198/04015/1420X